SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

Statement made by Prime Minister on 28th May, 1998 on Recent Nuclear Tests in Pokhran — *Contd.*

DR. B.B. DUTTA : Madam, I come from the periphery. I live in the North-East. We see so many things and we are facing so many problems with our experience. We can understand a little more as to what is happening in the North-West. We have got a direct perception. When I know that my Government, the Government of India, in terms of defence, is second to none, as an Indian, I have a different level of confidence. I have seen that in the North-East that confidence is missing. I have seen that by talking to people from the North-West, that the confidence is sinking. Recently, I was in Dacca. Some of my very progressive Muslim friends told me that we would not be able to retain Kashmir. Forget about it. Give it to them. We cannot retain it because they think that, over the years, fighting is going on there on an increasing scale and we are not equal to the task. It has only been intensified. A proxy war is going on. There has been no improvement of the situation. Hundreds of conferences and dialogues at so many levels had taken place. There have been a lot of killings. What has been the net result? The level of governance, the level of administration is sinking in those areas to such an extent that the civil administration is to be frequently aided by paramilitary forces. You call in the CRPF, the BSF, the Assam Rifles and occasionally, the Army. Is it not being caused by the external threat. There is a deepening doubt over our capacity to govern those areas and the desired confidence that the Government will be able to protect the life and property of the people is missing.

We want India a hard State. It must be a hard State, not a soft one. One of the former Prime Ministers had told me: "Yes, we cannot carry on with a soft State. We must have a defence policy that generates confidence among the people, particularly people who are facing atrocities on the borders, in those dangerous areas." What is happening in India? Many things one phenomenon is cleansing of population groups. Pandits have been evicted from Kashmir we count the number and say that over 2,50,000 pandits have been evicted. We count how many have been killed etc. we look at the situation through satistic. Human beings have become merely statistics. We don't realise the threat to polity. Any Indian citizen, whether he is a pandit or a Muslim, should be protected by the Government. In kashmir, the nationalist Indian Muslims are in overwhelming majority. They have a different history, different culture and their record is very clean. Now, we are not able to protect them. You see a cleansing process is going on. The Kashmir Valley is being cleansed out. This kind of development is sapping the energy of the entire country. Why should it happen? That is why, today you see that people are united behind nuclear Tests the entire nation is united. This is not an emotional outburst. No, this is an instinctive support dictated by instinctive wisdom. They want to see in Delhi a Government which is capable of saying that we are equal with the front ranking nations of the world. Take for instance, China. We are having friendly dialogue with China and we should continue to do that. My leader, Dr. Manmohan Singh, said that this situation should be observed and all our utterances should be restrained. We should not indulge in the language of a singoism and say all types of silly things. I completely agree with him, and whoever has said that, has done some damage and he should not continue doing so. I would like to quote what Shri I.K. Gujral, the former Prime Minister, has said in a letter to the Prime Minister. He has asked him to sign the C.T.B.T. I do not know why. I will come to that point later. He narrated in a statement which has come out in the Press also that when he met Clinton in the United States. He asked President Clinton to put himself in the shoes of Indian P.M. and then consider India's situation. And in reply, Mr. Clinton had said, "I understand." To Mr. Clinton's response he said I quote — "we have nearly a thousand-mile long border with Tibet or China, whatever you call it. That neighbour is nuclearised. We are in the Indian Ocean, and there is a place "Diego Garcia" which is nuclearised. India is within their range. Thanks to Saddam Hussain. You have so many flotillas many of which are carrying nuclear weapons." Mr. Clinton's response was, he decided to go to India to pay a visit and he sent his Secretary of State to India. That was the reply. But Mr. I.K. Gujaral, our former Prime

Minister, has beautifully narrated that situation. Madam, had it been the situation before America, what would they have done? Had it been before any other power, what would they have done? This is the question that haunts the minds of Indian citizens today. They have to be given a categorical answer. We are a democratic society. We are an open society. We shuold involve the general masses of the people, the educated people, the intellectuals, the media, the academicians in the debate. They should be involved in this debate so that we can generate confidence in their minds. Now if this is what Mr. Gujral's experience is, then I ask why do we not realize that we are badly threatened? Madam, U.S. has been telling us that if India goes nuclear—this argument I do not understand—there is going to be an arms race in South Asia! Are we responsible for the arms race? Is it not my duty to protect my citizens and my territory from Nuclear Arms race, you are responsible because you have started it first. Then came the Soviet Union and then came China. You have put us in serious situation. That is why India has taken the stand that nuclear disarmament is a global issue. Why did you try to regionalise it? By its very nature, nuclear is a global thing.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Mr. Dutta, you please conclude now because I have got a long list. Other Members from your Party would also like to speak on this subject. There is a long list of members before me.

DR. B.B. DUTTA: Madam, I will conclude within two minutes. Madam, nuclear weaponisation by nature is a global thing. If it is not, I can tell you—I have found from the Internet—how U.S. feels threatened by India going nuclear. If we could complete the Agni series of tests, then reach a level where we become a threat even to the United States of America. If the Indians achieved the planned Missiles programmes then running from about Raleigh. North Carolina to Omaha, to Nebraska to Engene Oregon, can be within its targets. But we don't feel threatened. Strange indeed. They feel threatened and they are all out to present our Agni Programme which holds the key to further advances in Missile development. In the South Asian Region their perceived threat can not be an issue. It only proves the point. Our policy of not signing the CTBT or the NPT is therefore very very right.

We have done a right thing, and we sould not sign it. I don't understand why Mr. Gujaral wrote to the P.M. to sign it because after these explosions, is there today any CTBT? And in what capacity does India sign? In what capacity? And what document does it sign? And after Pakistan has gone aheadwith the tests, what has happened to the CTBT? Has it not been further mauled? Again, maybe, one or two or three powers may come up with their series of tests and this proves India's contention at the nuclear disarmament conference. We can tell the Big Fire, you are responsible for this. We are not responsible for this. Madam, I tell you one thing. I will just make on more point within two minutes and then I will sit down. Because of the peaceful dimension in our nuclear research led by Jawaharlal Nehru, Homi Bhabha and others we have gained a lot of things because our nuclear base is so wide and strong today and that in terms of scientific excellence our level is enviable. Our programme is highly cost effective. The test that has been done and whatever other things that will follow from it, I am sure—I have had talks with the scientists—it is going to be highly sophisticated, wide ranging multipurpose and cost effective. And in the nuclear field itself there is a part, you can call it 'primitive'.

Those who went very fast went for weaponising and manufacturing weapons, shields, umbrellas and all these things. They spent thousands and millions on it. We need not address ourselves to this kind of a move. What is now required? We require a doctrine, a strategic doctrine, by which we could guide ourselves. But I repeat my point again that in the economic field, as Dr. Manmohan Singh has said, we are going to face extreme hardship. So, we must come up with some urgent programmes at the national level, comprising all political parties and assure ourselves that we can meet it. What has happened cannot be undone. I have put the question before the House that we want to be informed more about it, whether it was right or wrong, whether the non-weaponised deterrent posture was okay, whether going for nuclearisation was okay. We should be told with

facts and reasons. Yes, whatever has happened we stand by it. It is not BJP's programme. It is not any party's programme. It is a nation's programme. We must think of all those thingss along the line that Dr. Manmohan Singh has suggested. So, we should stop making irresponsible speeches and we should address ourselves only to this task. Madam, the sacrifices of those who became martyrs for the freedom of the country have been vindicated today. After these tests, the excellence of science and the feat of engineers and technicians have been commended by many all over the world. What is the lesson? It is a lesson that the self-reliant and independent science and technology policy. Coming out of the spirit of freedom struggle and forcefully enunciated by Jawaharlal Nehru has done us proud. This successful experiment is a tribute to our martyrs, to Nehru and others and to our scientists, technologists and personnel of the armed forces and to all. With these few words, I conclude. Thank you, Madam.

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA (Uttar Pradesh): Thank you, Madam Vice-Chairman. I rise to share the sentiments with the Prime Minister and to congratulate the scientists, the technicians, the defence personnel and the engineers who have through their achievements shown that we are second to none in the sphere of technology. We are proud of them and I salute them. We have all been discussing as to why these tests were conducted. We have also been debating about the timing of these tests. But I think the important question that has not been raised is: What now? What should be done? As the Prime Minister has stated in his statement, we are already a nuclear weapon State. National security not only relates to bombs and missiles, but it has also something to do with our economic strength. It has a social dimension. We have seen that Russia with all its technological advancement, with all its nuclear hardware, ultimately collapsed. We must analyse why it happened. It got into the race with the Star Wars programme of America, which its economy could not sustain and it collapsed. Now, we have already achieved this status. Our hon. Prime Minister has already proclaimed that we are a nuclear State.

Our hon. Defence Minister has already named his enemies number one and two.

SHRI NARENDRA MOHAN (Uttar Pradesh) : He has denied it. (*Interruptions*).

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता : जो एक बार खंडन कर चुके हैं तो उसको मानना चाहिए।.... (व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Please listen to him. ...(व्यवधान) इसमें इतना उत्तेजित होने का कोई कारण नहीं है।... (व्यवधान)

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA: He now claims that China is not number one enemy. But he has not said that there is no threat perception from China. There is a threat perception and the threat perception can only be from enemies. He has not denied it. In fact, he had confiremed it yesterday. He has also stated that we are now going to use nuclear weapons and we are going to weaponise. Therefore, Madam, we are in this nuclear arms race whether we like it or not. I am saying this on the basis of the statements made by the respectable members of our Government. Unfortunately, history teaches us one thing that we never learn from it. The recent occurrences in Russia seem to have taught us nothing. Therefore, I would like to move away from this discussion on why these tests and the timing of it, to a greater need that we have to address ourseleves in order that we can meet the other dimensions which are equally important as far as the national security is concerned.

I do not know what prompted the Government within 18 days of its coming to power for going in for these tests. But I can comment that it meets the needs of the only super power remaining in the world. The interest of the super power and our ruling party seem to strongly converge as for as the tests are concerned. As we are aware, America looks after its own interest first. In the 1970s when they had a problem with their currency, they removed the gold backing from their currency to dollar. In the late 1980s and in 1990 when they had a huge stockpile of obsolete arms, they were able to create this war in Iraq and they collected almost three hundred billion dollars for the obsolete arms that they lost. They were able to trade it off to poor countries. But America lives beyond its means. Therefore, it

has now greater needs and therefore, the need for this newly created arms race in this part of the world. Similary, I believe that the ruling party in India also had problems.

Therefore, these tests came in handy. That is way I say that the interests converge. The only thing that I feel is that instead of making large payments in the form of clearing Rs. 80,000 crores on various projects for the multinationals, we should gain something out of it. After all, we are helping their cause.

3.00 P.M. Rightly or wrongly, we are helping them. In this conflict, in this arms race that we have embarked upon, it will utimately wage a game of those who have been the supplier of arms throughout this region. The second thing which I would like to submit is that undoubtedly there is a great euphoria in the country. Through out the country there is a euphoria which may not last very long. But I would urge upon our Government to take advantage of it. There is a need for tightening our belts. There is a need for putting certain correctives in place like doing away with subsidies to farmers in the form of subsidised fertilisers and free power which in any case go to a very few rich farmers. There is a need that we privatise our losing private sector companies and there is a need, the greatest need, to tone up the management of this country, the administration of this country. And I think that the Government will be well-advised to utilise this euphoria and push down certain policies which may not be very popular. This is the right opportunity. It will help the country because, as I said earlier, national security is not only about arms and missiles but it is also to do with economics, as Manmohan Singhji mentioned yesterday.

Madam, with threse words, I conclude. But I would like to remind this Government that it will be missing a great opportunity if it does not put these correctives in place and not take some advantage of a misadventure which has already happened. Let it not be a total loser but try to make up in so far as India's long-trem interests, otherwise we may have lost totally.

DR. KARAN SINGH (Jammu and Kashmir) : Madam I must admit as an Indian who also looks upon himself as a global citizen and who has been travelling around the world for the last 20 years speaking of *Vedanta*, global consciousness, interfaith harmony and human unity and uttering the great *vakya Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* which is inscribed on the entrance to our Parliment House, and attacking the then prevalent philosophy of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) in the West, it is quite disconcerting to find ourselves in our own sub-continent in the same situation. Yesterday's nuclear tests by Pakistan have added a disturbing dimension to our debate. Certainly, our testing on 11th May was a major event in Indian history. But two points are now very clear. One is that Pakistan was only 17 days away from the bomb. I think that this is a point that should be noted because we tested on the 11th and they tested on the 28th. So, they were 17 days away from the bomb, much closer than many of us had imagined.

The second point that emerges, I must say, from the mature and sober statement made by the Prime Minister on the evolution of India's nuclear policy is that these tests have been, in fact, the culmination of a process. Belonging at this point of time neither to the rulling party nor to the Opposition, I can say very clearly that every major political party in Indian except the CPI (M) has, in fact, been committed, in some way or another, to testing. We now know that when Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao was the Prime Minister, he was also seriously considering a test. It is now confirmed that when Shri I.K. Gujral was the leader of the United Front Government which consisted of 13 or 14 parties, he was also considering a test. Now we have had the BJP-led coalition actually having the test. So, it seems to me that there was a consensus on not only keeping the option open but also at some point of time the testing although the timing itself must have varied.

Now, that being the case, I think the debate as to why it was tested now and what the reasons are, these are no longer valid. There are four points that I would like to make briefly on this important occasion. The first is that nuclear weapons are essentially weapons of deterrence. Their use can cause unimaginable disaster. For those who have not read it, I would urge them to read a book, 'The Day After' by

Johnathan Schell and you will get some idea of the sort of total havoc that can be caused with the actual use of atomic weapons. When J. Robert Oppenheimer, the great scientist, saw the first explosion in the Almagardo Desert in 1944 the words of the Bhagwad Gita came back to him,

"कालोस्मि लोक-क्षय-कृत् प्रवृद्धो,

लोकान समा-हर्तुम इह् प्रवृत्तः।

"I am Time, the mighty destroyer of the worlds, manifested now for the annihilation of the universe." Therefore, facile statements about using nuclear weapons have got to be made very, very carefully and with great restraint.

A lot of statements have been made. Pakistan's Foreign Minister, Gohar Ayub Khan, almost everyday issued a statement threatening to annihilate the Indian cities. The very fact, Madam, as was pointed out by my good friend, Shri B.B. Dutta, that the Pakistani missiles are named after the ruthless, fanatic invadors, and iconoclasts who created havoc in this country is itself a very dangerous sign. There are very great names in Islam. There are great caliphs, there are great scholars, there are great sufis. But no, they had to name them after these very people in a deliberate attempt to re-open old wounds and re-kindle ancient animosities I think we have got to react with great maturity and intelligence to this particular onslaught. That is the first point that I would like to make for great restraint, great wisdom and great maturity.

Secondly, Madam, we must now step up our efforts worldwide for nuclear disarmament, either through an improved version of CTBT or perhaps we could re-kindle, this is something I would suggest to the Prime Minister, the Rajiv Gandhi Initiative. If you remember, in 1988 he had made a very significant and important initiative called, "the global nuclear disarmament initiative." At that time nobody paid it any attention. But if we are able to refurbish that and perhaps present it again to the world, then the nuclear powers might be more inclined to look at it. We need full-time diplomats and I would like to say that this is a bit of advice to the Prime Minister. We need a full-time Foreign Minister. The young lady is doing very well. I would like to compliment her. But in the absence of a Cabinet Minister for foreign affairs, there is always a hiatus. I would say this on the basis of my own experience that either you are at a higher level with the Prime Minister or you have the Minister of State level. You do not have a proper level. Now the way diplomacy is going we have to gear up our diplomatic mechanism.

Thirdly, Madam, despite recent events we must re-establish bilateral dialogues with our neighbours, China and Pakistan for a peaceful settlement of all outstanding problems. One think, I think, is very clear and I would like my colleagues in this House and the country to appreciate this. Any territorial change of the *status quo* now is not possible without an agreement. I am choosing my words very carefully. I am not going into the legalities or the politics. I am simply making a factual statement for China, India and Pakistan, all three nuclear-weapon States. Any change in the present *status quo* can come about only through an agreement. Therefore, I think that we have to talk. Between us, these three nations are over one-third of the population of the human-race where the common problems of poverty, disease, ignorance and illiteracy are wide-spread. Let us see whether we can make a sincere and consistent effort to try to sort out our problems with our neighbours.

Fourthly, and finally, Madam, special attention needs to be given to the peaceful uses of nuclear power. I am surprised that nobody has mentioned this. It will interest the House to know that in France 87 per cent of their energy needs are met by nuclear power, whereas in India we have the Nuclear Power Corporation which barely produces three per cent of our power and you can see for yourself the sort of power situation we have. In addition to all these unimaginable destructive weapons, can we not harness our great engineering and technological skills in order to try and increase our production of electricity by nuclear energy?

Swami Vivekananda, a century ago said, "Strength is life, weakness is death". But he also said that strength is not only material, it is moral and spiritual. It is this deeper civilisational dimension that we must keep in mind, because it is here that India's real greatness lies.

श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी (उत्तर प्रदेश): उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदया, कल से यह सदन एक महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर चर्चा कर रहा है और इस विषय की गंभीरता कल जो घटनाएं हुई हैं, पाकिस्तान ने कल जो बम-विस्फोट किए, उससे और भी अधिक बढ़ गई है। मैं प्रारम्भ में ही यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि मेरे प्रतिपक्ष के नेता डा० मनमोहन सिंह और श्री प्रणब मुखर्जी ने कल और आज डा० दत्त और डा० कर्ण सिंह ने बहुत से महत्वपूर्ण पहलू हमारे सामने रखे हैं और बहुत से सुझाव दिए हैं। मुझे पूर्ण विश्वास है कि सरकार, जो एक उत्तरदायी सरकार है, जो एक संतुलित सरकार है–जिस सरकार के प्रधान मंत्री के बारे में श्री प्रणब मुखर्जी ने कहा था कि वे स्टेट्समैन-लाइक हैं, उनको राजनीति की विज्ञता है, उनके नेतृत्व में जितने भी पक्ष हैं, उनके ऊपर पूरा ध्यान रखकर, संतुलन से, नियंत्रण से और साथ ही साथ देश के विश्वास से, अपने आत्मविश्वास के साथ सरकार निर्णय करेगी और आगे का रास्ता खोजेगी।

मैं यहां पर यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि जो न्यूक्लिअर टैस्ट, जो आणविक परीक्षण हुए हैं, आप 1974 के टैस्ट को पोखरन एक कहें और 11 व 13 तारीख को हुए टैस्ट्स को पोखरन दो कहें, दोनों ही मैं समझता हूं कि एक राष्ट्रीय उपलब्धियां हैं और मैं यह पूरा विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूं अपने मित्र डा० मनमोहन सिंह को कि भारतीय जनता पार्टी का दृष्टिकोण इसके संबंध में कोई संकुचित या दलगत नहीं है और यह स्पष्ट हो जाता है प्रधान मंत्री के अपने स्वयं के वक्तव्य में, जो उन्होंने एक विस्तृत वक्तव्य दिया था, उससे। इसके साथ ही साथ हमारी न्यूक्लिअर पॉलिसी का विकास किस प्रकार से हुआ है, उसकी अलग-अलग जितनी भी घटनाएं हैं, जितने भी लैंड-मार्क्स हैं, मुख्य जो उसके भाग हैं, अंग हैं, उसमें हर जगह उन्होंने इस बात को अंकित किया है कि कोई भी सरकार इस देश में रही हो, इस संबंध में उसका दृष्टिकोण राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण रहा है और आज जो भारतीय जनता पार्टी की कोअलिशन सरकार है, उसका भी दृष्टिकोण राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण है और यह मैं आपको विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूं।

मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूं, हो सकता है कि जगह-जगह उत्साह होता है, आप उसको अंग्रेजी में एन्थ्यूजिआज्म कह सकते हैं, यूफोरिया भी कहा जाता है, कभी-कभी दोनों पर्यायवाची हो जाते हैं। लेकिन उत्साह होना अपने में उचित है और उत्साह का मार्गदर्शन किस प्रकार से हो रहा है, मैं समझता हूं कि इसके प्रति सरकार सचेत है और सतर्क है। कभी-कभी भावनाओं का एक उबाल सा आ जाता है। हो सकता है कि कभी कोई व्यक्ति कुछ इस तरह के शब्द इस्तेमाल कर दे जिसके ऊपर डा. मनमोहन सिंह या कोई और महानुभाव कुछ ऐतराज कर सकते हैं पर जहां तक भारतीय जनता पार्टी और उसके सहयोगी दलों का सवाल है, यह विशेष ध्यान रखने योग्य बात है कि भारतीय जनता पार्टी और उसके सहयोगी दलों ने जो नेशनल एजेंडा फॉर गवर्नेंस, इस देश के शासन को किस प्रकार से चलाना है, इसके लिए जो नेशनल एजेंडा तैयार किया है, यह उसी से मर्यादित है और उसी के ऊपर आधारित है। मैं समझता हूं कि हमें इस बात को ध्यान में रखना चाहिए।

अभी हमारे मित्र जयंत मल्होत्रा बोल रहे थे। मैं किसी विवाद में नहीं जाना चाहता। महोदया, मैं भी जानता हूं और पूरा सदन जानता है कि देश की सुरक्षा केवल सामरिक सुरक्षा पर निर्भर नहीं करती, देश की सुरक्षा के अन्य अंग भी हैं चाहे वह सामाजिक पक्ष हो, चाहे आर्थिक पक्ष हो और उनके ऊपर भी उतना ही ध्यान देना चाहिए और मैं समझता हूं कि प्रारंभ से ही इस देश की सरकारें इस संबंध में सावधानी बरतती रही हैं और आज की सरकार भी उसी प्रकार से सतर्क है। डा० मनमोहन सिंह ने इस संबंध में कई महत्वपूर्ण सुझाव दिए। मैं भी उस संबंध में कुछ और आगे कहना चाहूंगा। उन्होंने जो सुझाव दिए हैं, उनका मैं स्वागत करता हूं।

महोदया, मैं निवेदन कर चुका हूं कि जहां तक इसको दलगत और दलीय दृष्टि से, संकुचित दृष्टि से देखने का प्रश्न है, यह उचित नहीं है। जब हम इवोल्यूशन ऑफ इंडियाज, न्यूक्लियर पालिसी की ओर देखते हैं तो हमें कुछ बातें साफ दिखाई पड़ती हैं। मैं इस संबंध में दो-तीन बातें निवेदन करना चाहता हूं। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जो इस देश के प्रथम प्रधानमंत्री थे, उनका इस दिशा में क्या योगदान रहा, इसे डा० दत्ता ने और हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जी ने बहुत ही अच्छे शब्दों में हमारे सामने रखा है। उसके बाद शास्त्री जी का भी योगदान इसमें रहा लेकिन उनका कार्यकाल बहुत छोटा था। किस प्रकार से उन्होंने पहल की थी न्यूक्लियर एक्सप्लोसिव्ज और रिसर्च को आगे बढ़ाने में, यह सभी जानते हैं। उस समय बड़े रहस्यमय ढंग से डा. भाभा की मृत्यु हो गई और आज तक उस रहस्य का पर्दाफाश नहीं हो सका।

इसके बाद श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी का इस क्षेत्र में बहुत बड़ा योगदान रहा। इस दिशा में बहुत दबाव भी हमारे ऊपर आते रहे हैं। सन् 1970 में इसी प्रकार का एक अमरीकन नोट भारत में आया था कि भारत अपने यहां किसी प्रकार का आणविक परीक्षण न करे। श्रीमती इंदिरा

गांधी की सरकार ने उसे मानने से इंकार कर दिया था और उसे नकार दिया था। महोदया, उन्होंने 1972 में पार्लियामेंट में यह कहा था कि आवश्यकता के अनुसार शांतिपूर्ण ढंग से और शांतिपूर्ण उद्देश्यों को लेकर हमें जब भी आणविक परीक्षण की आवश्यकता होगी, हम वह करते रहेंगे। जब 1974 में पोखरण में परीक्षण हुआ, उससे डा० रामन्ना सीधे संबंधित थे और वे इसके बारे में बहुत कुछ बता चुके हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि वह एक ऐसा कदम था जिसने एन.पी.टी. की एक तरह से धज्जियां ही उड़ा दी थीं। उस समय पूरा देश उनके साथ था और कुछ इधर-उधर के विरोधों के उपरांत भी पूरा देश उनके साथ था, और इसी प्रकार से मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि राजीव गांधी का भी जो योगदान रहा वह बहुत ही बड़ा योगदान है उनका न्यूक्लियर इनीसिएटिव 1988 का और मैं समझता हूं कि वह भी उसी प्रकार से योगदान था प्रारम्भ से ही मगर साथ ही साथ इस प्रकार से वह हमारी रिसर्च आगे बढ़ती रहे, किसी प्रकार के दबाब में हम नहीं आएं, उसके भी उदाहरण उस समय से हमारे सामने हैं। क्योंकि कभी-कभी हम भी यह सोचते हैं कि 1974 के टैस्ट के बाद, परीक्षण के बाद क्यों नहीं उसमें और परीक्षण हुए। मैं कुछ कागजात देख रहा था तो उसमें एक बात समझ में आई कि जो दबाब थे-दबाब तो अपनी जगह पर थे लेकिन उस समय तत्कालीन प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने यह सोचा कि एक आवश्यकता यह है कि अगर हम इस देश को आणविक शक्ति बनाना चाहते हैं, तो बॉलिस्टिक मिसाइल का कार्यक्रम नहीं होगा केवल एयरोप्लेन सैंटर्ड डिलीवरी सिस्टम से ही काम नहीं चलेगा, अगर आवश्यकता हो तो उसके लिए डिलीवरी सिस्टम-बॉलिस्टिक मिसाइल लें और इसलिए उन्होंने बॉलिस्टिक मिसाइल के ऊपर जोर दिया। क्योंकि कभी-कभी यह प्रश्न उठता है कि क्यों उस समय सम्भव नहीं हुआ तो मैं सदन के सामने यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि वास्तव में ....(**समय की घंटी**)

मैडम, मेरा समय बीस मिनट है, मैं पूछकर आया था।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (कुमारी सरोज खापर्डे): जब आपने शुरू किया था तब सिर्फ38 मिनट आपकी पार्टी के बाकी थे। आपने शुरू किया है तीन बजकर 11 मिनट पर।

श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी: मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि आपकी आज्ञा का पालन करूंगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष कुमारी सरोज खापर्डे: संक्षेप में बोलिएगा।

श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी: संक्षेप में बोलूंगा लेकिन कुछ चीजें कहना आवश्यक हो जाता है। जब 1989 में अग्नि का प्रथम टैस्ट हुआ उसके बाद राजीव गांधी ने उन्हीं के शब्दों में मैं कहना चाहता हूं उनके ऊपर दबाव अलग-अलग अम्बेस्डर्स ने दिए। उन्हीं के शब्दों में-"I told them clearly that India would carry out the launch and we could not take our decision under pressure."

यह भी एक परम्परा रही है और वही परम्परा सब दबावों के बावजूद मैं समझता हूं कि अभी भी लागू है और इसमें ध्यान देने की बात यह है कि वास्तव में न्यूक्लिअर ऑप्शन हमारे लिए 1994 में संभव हुआ, उसको हम 1994 में एक्सरसाईज कर सके। अग्नि परीक्षण जिस प्रकार का होना चाहिए वैज्ञानिक ढंग से पूरी तरह से हो सका। यह कहना कि भारतीय जनता पार्टी इसका श्रेय लेना चाहती है मैं समझता हूं कि यह उसके साथ न्याय नहीं होगा। प्रश्न कई उठाए गए हैं। प्रथम तो मैं आपसे यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि 11 और 13 मई को जो परीक्षण हुए उससे किस तरह से अब हमारा देश न्यूक्लिअर वैपंस स्टेट है यह पूरी तरह से हमारे और आपके सामने प्रस्थापित हो गया। एडवर्ड टैलर जो हाईड्रोजन बम के जन्मदाता हैं, उन्होंने भी यह माना और कहा कि क्लिंटन को जो कि इस वक्त वास्तविकता है, रिएलिटी है उसके अनुसार इस दृष्टिकोण को देखना चाहिए और दूसरा, जो कि बार-बार कहा जा चुका है और मैं समझता हूं कि सबसे ज्यादा कठिनाई उन देशों ने पैदा की है जो हमारे सबसे बड़े आलोचक हैं। वह यह है कि हमारा जो एक स्तर था सोफिस्टिकेशन का, दक्षता का, वह एक गुणात्मक स्तर था हमारे वैज्ञानिकों का और वह इस प्रकार से एस्टेब्लिश हुआ है। साथ ही साथ जिस गोपनीयता से ये परीक्षण किए गए कि वे समझते थे कि वे हर जगह कार्टून के स्नूपी की तरह स्नूप कर सकते हैं, देख सकते हैं लेकिन यह उनके लिए संभव नहीं हुआ।

तीसरी बात यह है कि मैं अगर यह निवेदन करूं कि यह सही है कि जो पावर इक्वेशन एशिया में था, उसमें भारत का जो उचित स्थान था, वह हमारे सामने आ गया है। मेरे मित्र मलकानी जी ने कल इसके संदर्भ में कुछ कहा भी था। ए.एम.रोजेन्थाल जो बहुत वर्षों तक यहां रहे हुए हैं, वे आलोचक भी हैं भारत की नीतियों के, उन्होंने जो कहा उसका मैं थोड़ा सा अंश आपके सामने रखना चाहूंगा। यह है "दि शाउट फ्रॉम इंडिया"। हिंदुस्तान क्या कहता है अमेरिकन्स को? कहते हैं कि अमेरिकन्स को भारत के दृष्टिकोण से देखना चाहिए।

"The decision was made by India, and India will pay the economic price. But Americans should understand that it was the West,

particularly, the U.S., that built the policy road leading to the Indian underground explosions.

The utter shock in Washington shows more than an intelligence failure. It shows attitudes about India are the same Western mush of arrogance, ignorance and condescension that they have been for the half-century since Indian independence." मलकानी जी ने इसकी तरफभी आपका ध्यान दिलाया था। इसके बाद वे कहते हैं कि हिंदुस्तानी किस प्रकार से सोचता है? केवल अंतिम वाक्य मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं। "Is Mr. Clinton wise or brave enough to reconsider his frantic pursuit of China and the money U.S. businesses hope Beijing will pour over them? Well, at least, he can get the shock off his face about Indian independence of action, the murk out of his mind; it is about time.

Ordinary Indians do have hopes and fears about their country, just as if they were ordinary Americans. They are not in a silence mood. Head-patting decades are over. मैं आपका ध्यान इस ओर दिलाना चाहता हूं क्योंकि इस सदन में बहुत बार बातचीत हुई है कि हमारे लिए ड्यूअल यूज्ड टेक्नालॉजी को मना किया गया जबकि इस प्रकार का कोई प्रश्न भी नहीं था। साथ ही साथ दूसरे देशों को इस प्रकार की टेक्नालॉजी दी जाती रही कभी ऊपरी तौर पर और कभी उन्हीं की सरकार की, युनाइटेड स्टेट्स गवर्नमेंट की रिपोर्ट आने के उपरान्त भी उन देशों को टेक्नालॉजी ट्रांसफर होती रही और हम जानते हैं कि चीन से किस प्रकार से टेक्नालॉजी हमारे पड़ोसी देश पाकिस्तान को गई।

मैं आपसे यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि एक प्रश्न बार-बार यहां उठाया जाता था और उठाया गया है, मैं उसके अधिक विवरण में नहीं जाना चाहता लेकिन जो घटनाएं कल हुई हैं, उनसे यह स्पष्ट हो गया है कि जो हमारा सिक्योरिटी एनवायर्नमेंट था, हमारी सुरक्षा का जो वातावरण था, उसके संबंध मे यदि कोई आशंकाएं थीं तो वे पूर्णतया देश के सामने स्पष्ट हो गई हैं। जैसा कि अभी हमारे एक मित्र ने कहा कि डिगो गार्शिया से लेकर एनसकॅलिंग आर्क के रूप में अगर हम देखें तो पाकिस्तान को लेते हुए गल्फ और उसके बाद हार्मूस की खाड़ी तक जो सिक्योरिटी एनवायर्नमेंट है, कम से कम सन् 1987 से तो हमें पता ही है। हमारे कुलदीप नैयर जी यहां पर हैं, ये तो इंटरव्यू भी कर चुके थे वहां के लोगों का कि इतने बम बाहर से आए, इतने खुद बनाए हैं। तो इन चीजों के संबंध में तो विवाद की आवश्यकता नहीं है। वैसे सब यह जानते भी हैं कि उसके ऊपर मुकदमा भी चला है कि वह चोरी से आया था या अपने आप बनाया गया। मैं यह समझता हूं कि इससे यह स्पष्ट हो गया है कि भारत की जो राजनीति थी या जो हमारी नीति थी वह ऐंटीसिपेटरी थी। इसी वजह से यह जो ऐनवॉयरमेंट हमारे यहां पर प्रैजेंस ऑफन्यूक्लीयर वारहैड्स–इस पूरे क्षेत्र में है–जिसकी की अधिक आवश्यकता नहीं है और बराबर यह कोशिश करना कि हमारे देश की जो भी शक्ति है, आणविक शक्ति है, उसको कैद किया जाए, उसको रोल बैक किया जाए, यही एक बात बार-बार हमारे सामने रखी जाती थी। मैं एक ओर निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि उसका उत्तर दिया जा चुका है। अभी 1998 में ही क्यों, क्योंकि पहले भी इंद्र कुमार गुजराल जी, नरसिंह राव जी – उसके विवाद में जाने की आवश्यकता मैं नहीं समझता लेकिन एक चीज स्पष्ट है कि इस बात के संबंध में निर्णय लेना इस पर भी निर्भर करता है कि टैक्नालॉजिस्ट्स उसको किस प्रकार से क्षमता के साथ, सुविधा के साथ आफिशियलाइज़ कर सकते हैं क्योंकि कोई भी काम दो दिन में या चार दिन में नहीं हो सकता है। और फिर यदि उसमें देर हो जाती तो फिर सन् 1962 की तरह यह कह दिया जाता कि बहुत से खतरों के संबंध में हमने पहले से नहीं सोचा। अगर हम उसमें देर करते हैं तो एक चीज हमारे सामने स्पष्ट है कि देश की सुरक्षा को और अधिक खतरा पैदा हो जाता है। महोदया, सी.टी.बी.टी. का यहां पर बहुत अधिक जिक्र किया गया जो डिसक्रीमिनेटरी ट्रीटी है। मैं समझता हूं कि भारत सरकार इसके लिए सतर्क है, हमारी सरकार इसके लिए सतर्क है। उसके चार या पांच बिंदु हैं जिसकी आलोचना भारत देश करता आ रहा है – डिसक्रीमिनेटरी नेचर की। यदि उनके संबंध में कोई बात होती है तो शायद सरकार उसके ऊपर विचार करे लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि सी.टी.बी.टी. को मंजूर करने का तो कोई प्रश्न अभी तक देश के सामने नहीं आया है, दबाव हमारे ऊपर बराबर पड़ रहे हैं। चूंकि 1998 के अंत में सी.टी.बी.टी. की ट्रीटी फाइनल होने जा रही है और उसके स्ट्रेट जैकेट से, उसकी जकड़ से अगर हमें निकलना है तो मैं समझता हूं कि आवश्यकता से पहले ही हम अपने परीक्षण स्वयं कर लें। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, मैं दो और बातें कहकर अपना स्थान ग्रहण करूंगा। पहली तो यह है कि डॉक्टर मनमोहन सिंह जी के द्वारा जो प्रश्न उठाया गया है कि हमें क्या करना है और हमें अपने आर्थिक पक्ष को किस प्रकार से मजबूत करना है, और किन-किन चीजों के ऊपर हमें ध्यान देना पड़ेगा तो मैं समझता हूं कि वह तो बहुत महत्व के प्रश्न हैं और इसीलिए इसमें संतुलन लाने की आवश्यकता है, हमारी वाणी में या जो कुछ हम करें, उसमें संतुलन लाने की आवश्यकता है। मैं यह नहीं

मानता इससे किसी प्रकार का प्रभाव हमारी आर्थिक व्यवस्था पर पड़ेगा लेकिन फिर भी हमें यह मानना पड़ेगा कि हमारे देश की आर्थिक व्यवस्था ऐसी है कि हम उसका मुकाबला कुछ समय तक कर सकते हैं। इसलिए आवश्यकता है कि सही प्रकार की नीतियां बनाई जाएं। हम किस प्रकार से जो हमारे ह्यूमैन रिसोर्सिज़ हैं, जो हमारे मानवीय संसाधन है, उनका उपयोग किस प्रकार से करे और किस प्रकार से जो हमारे फॉरेन इनवैस्टर्स हैं, एन. आर.आईज़ हैं, हम किस प्रकार से उनको प्रोत्साहन दें, यह देखना जरूरी है। साथ ही साथ चाहे वह पाकिस्तान हो, पाकिस्तान का क्या रुख रहा है, उसका दृष्टिकोण क्या है, किस प्रकार से उन्होंने अपने शस्त्रों के नाम रखे हैं, यह सब हमारे सामने है मगर इन सब बातों को ध्यान में रखते हुए हमें उनसे बार-बार बहस करनी है, उनसे विचार-विमर्श करना है - चाइना से भी और पाकिस्तान से भी। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने स्वयं ही उसमें फर्स्ट नॉन-यूज़ ऑफर दिया। लेकिन मैं यह समझता हूं कि सबसे महत्वपूर्ण यह होगा कि हमारे हिन्दुस्तान का बिज़िनेस और इंडस्ट्री, हमारी सारी आर्थिक नीतियां - किस प्रकार से हम उनका निर्धारण करते हैं ताकि इस समस्या का हम निदान कर सकें। क्योंकि हमारे जो आलोचक देश है जिन्होंने हमारे ऊपर प्रतिबन्ध लगाए हैं उनके संबंध में हमें कुछ कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। जापान की मानसिकता को हम और आप समझ सकते हैं। मगर बहुत से ऐसे देश हैं जिनको न्यूक्लियर अम्ब्रेला उपलब्ध है और यदि वह आलोचना करते हैं तो मैं समझता हूं कि वह अनुचित है। उसी प्रकार से एक बात और हमारे और आपके सामने स्पष्ट है कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जो आर्थिक संस्थाएं हैं वे किस प्रकार से, राजनीतिक कारणों से और राजनीतिक इशारों के ऊपर चलती है और किस प्रकार की हैजीमनी अमरीका अपनी स्थापति करना चाहता है गांधी जी को कल बहुत कोट किया गया और आज भी उसके संबंध में कहा गया कि जब हीरोशिमा के ऊपर बम गिराये गए तो उसके दो-तीन दिन के उपरान्त उनसे कई प्रतिष्ठित जर्नलिस्ट मिलने गए और उन्होंने महात्मा जी से कहा कि महात्मा जी आप विशेष चिन्तित दिखते हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि वह क्यों, क्या किसी आणुविक बम के कारण? उन्होंने कहा कि उसके संबंध में तो मैं अपनी प्रतिक्रिया पहले ही व्यक्त कर चुका हूं लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं इसके साथ ही साथ एक बड़ा खतरा मुझे नजर आता है और उसमें उन्होंने हेजोमनी शब्द का इस्तेमाल किया। एक मोनोपली, एकाधिकार एक विशेष देश का हो रहा है और मैं समझता हूं कि उसको तोड़ने में हमारा यह परीक्षण सफल हुआ है और इसी कारण से आप यह देखते हैं कि हमारे जो आलोचक देश हैं, जो विकासशील देश हैं, विकासशील देश के लोग ही नहीं बल्कि जो पहले से ही विकसित देश हैं वे अपने एकाधिकार को लेजिटिमाइज करना चाहते हैं। इसके कारण से मैं निवेदन करता हूं कि इस परीक्षण की जो उपलब्धि है वह राष्ट्रीय उपलब्धि है। प्रणव मुखर्जी यहां पर उपस्थित हैं वैसे तो उन्होंने कल न्यूक्लियर पालिसी की सराहना की लेकिन उन्होंने एकाध शब्द के संबंध में कहा कि क्या फोकस लीडरशिप पहले थी या नहीं थी। मैं समझता हूं कि इस संदर्भ में अक्सर प्रश्न यह उठता है कि कंट्रोल सिस्टम किस तरह से है ....

उपसभाध्यक्ष कुमारी सरोज खापर्डे: चतुर्वेदी जी, प्लीज वाइंड अप।

श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी: इन चीजों के संबंध में, जिस प्रकार से आपने अपने लेख में भी लोजीकल कनक्लूजन उसका पूरी तरह से दिया है और मैं समझता हूं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उसको अपने ढंग से सदन के सामने और देश के सामने रखा है और उसी राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण से भारतीय जनता पार्टी और उसकी सरकार इस मामले की देखती है, वह इसको दल के हित में, दल के दृष्टिकोण से नहीं देखती है परन्तु इसको राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण से देखती है। इसीलिए आवश्यक हो जाता है, जैसा कि मेरे मित्र ने कहा कि आज हम एक इतिहास के ऐसे मोड़ के ऊपर खड़े हैं, इतिहास के मोड़ पर ही नहीं बल्कि मैं समझता हूं कि इतिहास ने पूरे देश को एक कठघरे में खड़ा कर दिया है और हमें निर्णय यह करना है कि हम कैसे एक विश्व के सामने, एक हमारी जो संगठित शक्ति है, हमारी जो संगठित इच्छा शक्ति है, हमारी जो एकता की भावना है, उसको प्रदर्शित करें। उसको हम उसी प्रकार से प्रदर्शित करें जिस प्रकार का कश्मीर के संबंध में रिजोल्यूशन आया या जब चीन ने हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण किया तब आया। मैं समझता हूं कि आज देश की स्थिति जैसी है उसी के अनुसार यहां से हमारी एकता की ध्वनि पूरे विश्व के सामने जानी चाहिए क्योंकि वहीं ध्वनि, यदि आप प्रधान मंत्री जी के भाषण को देखें या प्रधान मंत्री जी के द्वारा दूसरे जो इवोल्यूशन ऑफ इंडिया न्यूक्लियर पालिसी का जो स्टेटमेंट दिया हुआ है, मैं समझता हूं कि वहीं ध्वनि उसमें भी गुंजलित होती है। धन्यवाद।

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE (Tamil Nadu): Madam Vice-Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity given to me to participate in the discussion which is very important in its nature, based on the statement made by the Prime Minister on the recent nuclear tests.

Madam I congratulate our scientists, our technical experts and our defence personnel who have made this achievemnt possible. At this time, I remember with gratitude, those political leaders who, with their prophetic outlook, made this great achievement possible. I also remember, with gratitude, our scientists who had done scientific research, who had planted the first seed in this direction, but who are not living today.

I am here not to question the policy of our scientists, the dedication of our technical experts and the sincertity of our defence personnel. But I am at a loss to understand as to what political or strategic compulsions the Government had in regard to the timing of the nuclear tests.

I have been following the various speeches made by our political leaders, both from the treasury benches and from the oppostion. I find, there is a tendency to compare the 1998 nuclear tests with the nuclear test of 1974. I would like to point out to my friends, through you, Madam, that such a comparison is not possible.

I would like to point out that 1974 is not 1998. The situation in 1974 was totally different. The politiccal situation was totally different. The follow-up action was totally different. In 1974, after India conducted its first nuclear test, Madam Indira Gandhi made it amply clear to the entire world that the test was meant only for peaceful purposes. She repeatedly made it clear. If you go through the statement she made in the Lok Sabha then, you would find that at every second sentence, she mentioned that the nuclear test was meant for peaceful purposes.

What about the 1998 nuclear tests? You have made an emphatic declaration that these tests are for weaponisation; these are meant for waging a war; this amounts to threatening our neighbours with weapons of mass destruction. As a follow-up to these nuclear tests, we have seen the boisterous statements made by responsible Ministers in the Government. This was not the case in 1974.

Morcover, in 1974, Madam Indira Gandhi had the total mandate of the people. She had the total mandate of the House. But this is a Government which is existing on a precarious majority. This is a Government which is flying with borrowed feathers and standing on stolen legs. *(Interruptions)* You are standing on suspended support. You are surviving on suspended support. What authority, what moral authority, you have got to commit the nation to an enormous defence expenditure? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU (Kernataka): Six months back, it was the same case. It was at your mercy that they were running the Government. .

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: Not at all.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: It was. Two times the Government was pulled down.

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: We were part and parcel of the Government. We never took such hasty decisions. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Mr. Alphonse, would you please address the Chair?

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: Yes, Madam.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (Miss Saroj Khaparde): No cross-talk like this.

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: My friends should also know this, Madam.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): You should not look at the other side. You should address the Chair.

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: I have to answer the point, Madam.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Don't respond.

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: I have said it very clearly. This is a Government which is flying with borrowed feathers and standing on stolen legs. How can such a Government commit the country to an enormous defence expenditure? This needs to be explained by the Government.

Madam, between 1974 and 1998, there is a vast change in the policy. In 1974, our stand was that our nuclear option was open.

Now you have made a change by putting a word therein. You have said, "Nuclear option is nuclear weaponisation." You have made it

clear. There is a vast difference between "options being open" and "weaponisation with the nuclear arsenal." There is a vast difference between the situations. That is why I request you not to compare 1974 with 1998.

Another thing is that after what Pakistan did yesterday, you have made us answerable not only to the international community that suspects this peace-loving nation and questions its bona fides, but you have let down your own country people by your action. My learned friend quoted extensively from the "TIMES". I want to quote from the editorial of "THE HINDU", and I invite the Government's attention to this.

> "With Pakistan's detonation of five nuclear devices yesterday, indicating an inevitable succumbing to the pressure of the arms race initiated by India under the stewardship of the Vajpayee administration, it is painfully clear that the region is heading for a period of grave crisis. There is little doubt that the provocative and chauvinistic attitude struck by the Vajpayee Government have brought the country to the edge of a precipice."

This is not an editorial written in America. This is not a statement by a leader of the Opposition. This is the most respected national daily that has given the editorial, saying that you have provoked them and that you are the reason for the arms race in this sub-cotinent. What is your answer to that? Who is going to give an explanation for that?

I suspect your threat percept. The Defence Minister was quoting extensively from various reports. Not a layman or a leader of the Opposition but the General has stated this yesterday, and I quote:

> "I do not see a war scenario building up on either side."

This is not a statement made by me or by anybody else from the congress Party or by anybody from the United Front. It is not from Pakistan or from America. Your own Chief of the Army Staff has said this yesterday. He said:

> "There is no war-like situation."

Regarding the percept on China, he has gone one step further. I quote:

> "He was equally re-assuring about the situation in the India-China border region. Dealing briefly with a question on the subject, he said that both sides were observing the confidence-building measures. "I do not see anything happening on the ground," he said, adding that there was no element of hostility when the patrols from the two sides covered the areas where the Line of Control was defined."

This is not a certificate issued by a man outside your region. Your own Army chief says that there is no reason for hostility, that there is no suspicious movement and that there is no preparation for war. When? This is the situation after you made this nuclear test. Even after the nuclear test was made, your Army chief gives a certificate like this. What was the compelling reason that forced you to make the test, and what is the percept? Have you got any other agency apart from the Army General to certify about the conditions prevailing on the border? have you got any extra-constitutional agency to inform, to assess and to report it to you? You have to tell this to us, and we have to be convinced.

Don't say that we are not patriots. We are equally interested in the country. We have stood by the organisation which is in the service of this country for the past 100 years. Series of its leaders have sacrified thier lives for the country. No other leader has sacrified his life for this country. Only those belonging to the organisation to which I belong have done so. So, we do not lag behind you. We have got a more sincere interests in the security of this country. We want to know the reason that compelled you to do this. How can you push the country to an enormous defence expenditure?

There was an article in "THE HINDU". I would like to remind my friends on the other side about this. It was titled, "The Danger of Being in Red." I suspected it to be an article regarding my communist friends. Do you know what it is about? In the Ayodhya Hills, a young mother in the morning, gives bath to his child, gives him good clothes and sends him to the road. For what purpose? To pimp for her. This is the situation in the country. To pimp for his own mother, a child is dressed up and sent by a mother for bread, for a single day meal! The Prime Minister asks for sacrifice. The BJP

Government asks us to sacrifice. What have we got to sacrifice? We have got nothing except our under-garments. We do not have a hut to live in; we do not have a full square meal and what else do you want us to sacrifice when 53 per cent of the people are living below the poverty-line.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister, when you do not even have the power to allot portfolios to your own Ministers, how can you bind this great country to a great path? Can it be imaginable? I know, if the lady from Madras writes another letter to the President, you will all become a Council of Ex-Ministers. *(Interruptions)* I am not yielding.

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता (मध्य प्रदेश): आप आ जाइये न।..(व्यवधान) 6 महीने आप सरकार चला नही सके ..(व्यवधान) यह पावर्टी आपकी वजह से आई।.. (व्यवधान)

श्री ओंकार सिंह लखावत (राजस्थान): महोदया, मैं एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूं। यह देश के लिए नाजुक अवसर है। आपके और हमारे विवाद हो सकते हैं, मतभेद हो सकते हैं ..(व्यवधान) परन्तु यह कहना कि पाकिस्तान को हम ने प्रोवोक किया ..(व्यवधान) मैं कहता हूं देश भक्त लोगों आप सोचो ..(व्यवधान)

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता: सारा देश एक है।.. (व्यवधान)

श्री ओंकार सिंह लखावत: यह इतिहास में लिखा जाएगा।..(व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Have I allowed you to speak? Please sit down. *(Interruptions)* I do not want to hear anything. *(Interruptions)* Mr. Alphonse, please wind up.

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: I am addressing only the Chair and not you. And if I am wrong, I am ready to stand corrected. *(Interruptions)* Please listen to me. You cannot scuttle me.

I would prefer to stand corrected, if I am proved wrong. What I said was that the Prime Minister had lost his prerogative to allot his portfolios to his Ministers. How can an ex-Chief Minister allot portfilios to the Ministers? *(Interruptions)* Was it not in the newspapers? When a Minister resigned, she herself announced it. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Please come to the subject now.

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: I am well within my subject.

SHRI NARENDRA MOHAN: We are not discussing poverty; we are not discussing Tamil Nadu.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Have I allowed you, Mr. Narendra Mohan?

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Madam, can we disccuss about a lady who is not here?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (Miss Saroj Khaparde): Nobody is discussing a lady who is not here. Please don't raise an issue out of an issue. *(Interruptions)* Please, take you seat. Kindly don't indulge in this kind of a thing.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Let me bring to your notice with a heavy heart. The hon. Member thrice mentioned "Your" Army Chief. Please put the record straight. There is no "my" Army thief or "your" Army Chief. The Army Chief is for India. Let him stand corrected.

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: He is my Army Chief. Is it all right?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Army Chief is an Army Cheif. Army Chief does not belong to any political party. He is for the country. That is all.

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: Yesterday, Madam, our senior Member of the House, hon. S.R. Bommai, expressed the apprehension that by choosing to conduct nuclear tests, we have played into the hands of America, which deliberately wants an arms race in the sub-continent. I endorse his apprehension. There is every substance to suspect like that. I am at a loss to understand when the European Community chose to close their rank and file and bury their differences forming into a common business and industrial friends, why should the Asian communities fight with each other? It is an irony that when eleven countries of Europe, which were fighting amongst themselves barely some ten years ago could come together for a common currency called "Euro-Dollar".... Why can't we be a part and

parcel of that nation which was united just a generation back? We should bury our differences and avoid huge, enormous defence expenditure and look after the poorest of the poor people in the whole world.

Another important aspect which I would like to point out, through you, to the Government is that they should not bring their enemies closer by their words and deeds. Even a layman knows about it. I am at a loss to understand how this important aspect of diplomacy was ignored when you pushed Pakistan towards China. What is the diplomacy? I don't say that China was not helping Pakistan before May 11th.

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता: कौन-सी दुनिया में रह रहे हैं श्रीमान जी। दुनिया कहां से कहां जा रही है।

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: I am not speaking to you. ..(*Interruptions*)... I am not speaking to you. I don't say that China was not helping Pakistan before May 11th. I know that Pakistan was helped by China in its defence establishments and exercises. What I wanted to tell you is that you should justify the purpose of their alliance. Both China and Pakistan have got a case to argue before the international community. I don't understand the logic behind bringing China and Pakistan closer. You say that sanctions will not be doing any harm to the Indian economy I will tell you in my State....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Please conclude.

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: I will conclude within two minutes. I remember one district, Dharmapuri, a God-forsaken district, a drought-prone district, was getting Rs. 400 crores of Japanese aid to provide drinking water to 96 small towns and villages. Now the Japanese aid has been stopped. Who is going to provide Rs. 400 crores to the water-starving people? You are all living in Delhi in air-conditioned rooms, you do not know what is happening in villages. There are people who travel three miles to fetch a pot of water. Only with Japanese aid they were to get water. Now that has been stopped.

In Ramanathapuram, fishing is the only livelihood for fishermen. They were selling fish at Rs. 50 per kilo, now, after the nucelar test, it has come down to Rs. 20 per kilo. Now who will give food to the fishermen? They are starving. The whole day they go for deep fishing, fighting between the sky and the earth.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Mr. Alphonse, please conclude. This is not the way to speak. If you go on speaking, speaking, other Members would not get a chance to speak.

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: Madam, while concluding, I submit that my party, Tamil Maanila Congress stands by the Government in its efforts to find out the road map for the roll back. What has been done has already been don. For what you have done, the country should not suffer. We are interested more in the country than in you. We stand by the Government in its fight against imperialism, foreign and European powers. Our request is that peace should be restored in the sub-continent. Thank you.

रक्षा मंत्री (श्री जार्ज फर्नांडीज): मैडम, अगर आप क्षमा करें। माननीय सदस्य ने सेनाधिकारी का यहां पर जिक्र किया और उन्होंने कुछ कल जो बयान दिए थे उसका उल्लेख किया। तो मैं एक ही वाक्य उनके बयान का पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूं ताकि यह संदेश नहीं जाए कि सेनाधिकारी, यह जो कुछ हो रहा है इसके विरोध में हैं

> "Welcoming India's nuclear capability and weaponisation programme, Gen. Mullick said that the country's Armed Forces always sought nuclear deterrence to neutralise threat to the country's security. By conducting the nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests, we have demonstrated that we are not a push over when it comes to national security and that we are not a soft State."

यह जनरल मलिक का बयान है।

SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR (nominated): Madam Vice-Chairperson, I am not surprised at Pakistan exploding the bomb. In 1987 I interviewed Dr. A.Q. Khan, and I think, I was the only one who had interviewed him so far. Mr. Mushaid Hussain, the then Editor of "Muslim" is now the Information Minister in the Nawaz Sharif Government, he was with me. During his conversation with me, he had made it clear that they had the bomb. Not only that, he said, "Mr. Nayyar, if you ever drive us to the war, we will use the bomb."

4.00 P.M.

That is about eleven years ago. So, there is no surprise that Pakistan really exploded the bomb. My feeling is that if India had not exploded the bomb, they would not have done it this time. I think the BJP-led Government has a particular agenda and they are driving us to a State which is right wing militant State. The nation is not going to take it lying down because with 180 seats, you cannot change the agenda of the nation. I am sorry to say that what the situation is. Let us be very clear, let us be very sober about it that they have the bomb. They and we are now on par; whether their scientists have got it from China or America clandestinely that is not the problem now. The problem is that they have the bomb and they can destory us as much as we can destroy them. So, there is no question of the speeches which the Treasury Benches are making. They are still thinking as if they are living in some other kind of a world. Now, this is a nuclear threat, and saying that: "Look here, we are prepared for all eventualities", will not serve the purpose. What does this mean? This is all tall talk and this is the talk which has brought us to this day. I personally think that this whole thing, the decision to explode the bomb was political decision and the jingoism that has gone after that, the statements which have been made, specially by Mr. Advani, convinces me: "Look here, there is more than that." What does he say? He says that now after the bomb explosion, the Kashmir issue has to be interpreted or dealt with accordingly. What do you mean? They also have the bomb. So, what does he mean? (*Interruptions*)

प्रो॰ विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा (दिल्ली): 1974 का भी ऐसा ही है। ...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता: कब तक हाथ जोड़ते रहोगे। ...(**व्यवधान**)

SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR: I agree with you. I concede that there is a proxy war going on. I concede that their militants are coming from that side. But are you going to leavel off Pakistan?

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: Now, what is the solution?

SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR: If you give me time, I shall come to the solution. I will come to that point also.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (कुमारी सरोज खापर्डे) : गुप्ता जी, मुझे लगता है कि अभी आपका रोल बदल गया है क्योंकि आप इधर आ गए हैं, हम लोग उधर आ गए हैं। जब इधर लोग बैठते हैं ...(**व्यवधान**) सुनिए, जब हमारा रोल बदलता है...(**व्यवधान**) सुनिए, बिल यू लिसन टू मी ...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री एम॰ वेंकैया नायडु: आप हमारी उपसभाध्यक्ष हैं। ..(**व्यवधान**)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (कुमारी सरोज खापर्डे): मैं यहां जब बैठी हूं तो मैं किसी पार्टी को बिलांग नहीं करती, लेकिन यहां से मैं रूलिंग जरूर दे सकती हूं। जब पार्टियों का रोल बदलता है तो हम में कुछ संयम होना चाहिए। अगर कोई कुछ अपनी बात रखता है तो उसको सुनने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए, टोका-टाकी नहीं करनी चाहिए। अभी तक किसी ने टोका-टाकी नहीं की है, आप लोग भी टोका-टाकी मत करिए। पहले सुन लीजिएगा। हर मैंबर को यहां पर अपनी बात रखने का अधिकार है। ...(**व्यवधान**)

प्रो॰ विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा: इनको भी समझाइये। थोड़ी देर में टोकेंगे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (कुमारी सरोज खापर्डे): आप रिएक्ट मत करिएगा, मल्होत्रा जी, आप तो सीनियर मैंबर हैं।

SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR: I am coming to the solution. But for God's sake, prepare the ground first. Another thing has been started by Mr. Advani today. He said: "Look here, we are not really against secularism" because they have already demolished the Babri Masjid. "We are now against these liberals." Why are they against these liberals? What is wrong with it? Will there be no liberals in this country? There is no dictatorship yet. So, why are you talking about this kind of things and why are you trying to divide the country? We know that you have made a mistake. But the country comes first. We are all with the country We are not going to punish you because of this, because there is a bigger danger. When the question of country comes, we are all with you whether it is a question of war, whether what you have done is right or wrong, good or bad, when we come to that question, we are for the country. But for God's sake, don't divide the nation as you are trying to do. That is my point.

Let me now come to the solution. I do not know whether the Government read carefully the statement coming from there. He said, "We are willing to have talks with you, including the core issue of Kashmir." They have mentioned about Kashmir. So, don't think that since they are offering, you must hold the talks on what you are prepared to do on Kashmir. Now the BJP policy is not even to recognise 370. Other parties or this nation gave pledge to the Kashmiris, when they acceded to India, "Look here, we shall really repsect your autonomy."

SHRI RAMDAS AGARWAL (Rajasthan): What is this? ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Just listen to him, Mr. Agarwal. Please listen to him. Let him speak.

SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR: We have included that into the Constitution. What I am trying to say is, within India—I am not thinking of anything outside India; I am saying 'within India'— autonoy of Kashmir should be considered because that may be one way to talk to these people, to the militants. After all, if we have settled with the militants, then we are in a stronger position. Sometimes, we can talk to Pakistan because under the Simla Agreement we have to talk to them. I have recently been to Srinagar. I am sorry to say, I am an Indian, but the rule there is like an Opposition. Anybody is picked up. I am not saying that the Centre is to be blamed because it is an elected Government there. Why shouldn't this Government be able to do something? Mr. George is very close to Kashmir. Why shouldn't they give some better administration? Why shouldn't they treat them as human being? That is the way to win them, not like the earlier one.

Let me make some more suggestions. Now, the test has been done. One thing Mr. Nawaz Sharif has said, and that is, "From today I am going to leave this palatial house and I am going to a pocket."

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Because emergency is declared!

SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR: May be, that is so. If my information is correct, our Prime Minister, Mr. Vajpayee, is occupying two houses because some astrologer said that he must occupy!

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Why do you quote a person?

SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR: I said 'the Prime Minister of my country' Let the Prime Minister of my country have austerity. Let us have austerity. If you are thinking of austerity, let us start somewhere. Let all the Ministers have some austerity and then the officers below will follow them. After all, you are going to face such a challenge at this time.

Let me give two-three examples. One is this. Now you have exploded the bomb, and Pakistan also has done that. I think we should hold talks with Pakistan, if not really on Kashmir — because that can come later—but on what should be our attitude towards the West. The West, America or people like that are the powers which are going to decide the mebership. Maybe, we should think of it that all the threshold States, if they are not made members of the Club, should be recognised at least somewhere nearabout. Threshold members are Israel, Pakistan and India. Maybe, we must try to do something so that it looks as if we are doing something. The other thing is we must think of signing the CTBT. I don't think of any agreement between us and Pakistan. Althouth we have many agreements with Pakistan in which we have failed, still any settlement on nuclear will leave the doubts because now we are entering into a cold war, a cold war between India and Pakistan, and it is going to be like the one between America and the Soviet Union, just like when they were travelling with bombs in aeroplanes because they were afraid. It is going to happen. So, please start doing this thing. Maybe, the Prime Minister has given an offer "no first use". Say "non-use", and unilaterally say, "We will not use the bomb." Say that. That will help some way. Maybe, we can retrieve some people from that side. I can tell you that people there are just like you. They are also afraid and they are also living in this small region of insecurity. It is not that we are different. We are the same kind of people. You go across the world, then you will realise that. Let us not indulge in all kinds of ultimate or, sometimes, jingoism. Let us try to win them or let us do whatever we can do.

Last though not the least, at the moment the BJP is very happy. They may say, "Look

here, we have created this kind of a euphoria or this kind of a jingoism." Mrs. Gandhi exploded the bomb in 1974 and in 1975 she had to impose the emergency. That party is at least not with the Government. But what I am affraid is that they will have to do something like that. The people here are not going to accept the line which they are adopting by driving this country into some kind of a Hindutva State. Thank you.

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH (Gujarat): Madam Chairperson, I would like to say first that in this debate it is very important that we all speak with a sense of responsibility which is required in this somewhat difficult phase of our country's history. As far as I am concerned, I had described the requirements of our national security from the technological angle, from the angle of food security and from the angle of energy security in my P.C Lal lecture two months ago when I was Minister of State for Science and Technology. I would like to place my views there on record, since it is difficult to speak in detail on a subject like this in the time available. What I am saying within the overall context of the perspective of that lecture. To be fair to the treasury benches, I would like to get two points out of the way before I begin my more serious argument. The Defence Minister yesterday brought out effectively a specific argument, namely that there are some influential sections in this country including the Ministry of Defence which have been wanting nuclear deterrents. I must also say that, at least, I belong to that group of people who don't look upon the bomb as a moral question, but as a question which has to be looked at from the angle of national security. I must say right at the beginning that one does have the confidence, and it has been stated by different sides of the House that whatever the difficulties the country may face, we have a system and the capabilities within ourselves to overcome them. Having said all this, I think, there are a few questions which need to be posed in a slightly sharp manner.

The good statement by the hon. Prime Minister talks about the calculus of national security. The word "calculus", when it is used in the context of national security, has a particular meaning. In mathematics and logic calculus means that you take into account the implications of what you have done. I talked about security in my P.C. Lal lecture. In security analysis the most obvious pay-off—this is what war-mongers all over the world generally talk about —is generally very inefficient. When you contemplate a course of action you must look at the responses from other countries. The word "calculus" really means that you should take into account what others are going to do and your response should be such that it should show that you will be able to follow your interest. In other words, you should be able to tell your adversary that it is not in its interest to create difficulties for you when you pursue your national interest. It is in that sense I say, with due respect to the treasury benches, that the documents which have been placed by the treasury benches or the intervention of senior Ministers do not give us a perception as to how they see the events of the last few weeks in terms of India's national security environment. In fact, the word 'calculus' has been used by some young professors whom I had an opportunity to hire in the JNU. They have been talking about it on television. They have been using the term in a very different sense than the sense in which we are discussing it here. I think it is very important for the Treasury Benches to tell us that after this bomb what do they expect and how do they expect to take a broader line. One is not talking about details. But if they are talking about taking the country into confidence, then we have to be told as to what they expect about the sequence of events and how do they expect to play this game as we go along.

One of the arguments we have been given is, and, I think, the best version of it was given by my friend, Shri Chaturvedi, and that is the argument which I used in my P.C. Lal lecture also that when you demonstrate technological strength, you are in a sense trying to pursue your national interest. Now this argument has been looked at fairly closely. In some cases we have succeeded. For example, we have succeeded in the case of super computer. I have described elsewhere that the fact that we did develop super computing capabilities, meant that the USA which was earlier imposing restrictions on India, abolished those restrictions. In fact, a couple of years ago, export of super computer to India was allowed. If you

take the 'Param' Dr. Joshi is not here, he is probably the Chairman—Param is one which is from C-DAC of which I was the Chairman, that is definitely a strategic response. Now we have succeeded there. There are other cases where as Chaturvediji said, we have failed. But the argument of technology is not an argument if it is being seriously talked about in regard to the national security which is related with the big bomb alone. In fact, from the experiments that India has done, it is quite clear to those, unless one wants to be very jingoistic about it, that the more important thing is the scientific experiment was a low intersity thermo nuclear explosion. It showed that you have the capability of a higher kind rather than a big bomb. Some people jokingly said that the big bomb can be designed by a high school graduate in an American school. That is not the issue. In a way, I think, my friend, Shri Chaturvedi, did not get the real issue. Our nuclear capability or technological capability is well known. He asked, "What happened from 1974 onwards?" I would say that something like the Kamini reactor, the fast breeder reactor is way ahead in terms of technological capability. We are the only country in the world which has a fast breeder reactor, based on thorium, which it has produced in spite of restrictions. The Kamini reactor which is working is of an experimental kind. It can produce the amount of power which can light perhaps some parts of Parliament. But we have the capability to produce a 500 megawatt reactor. I am not saying this. My friend, Prof. Chidambaram, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission said just four days ago that our technological capability was not just a bomb, it also fast breeder reactor. Then there is what we have done in terms of rocketry.

I can even quote some of our great achievements in bio-technology. I am surprised with the argument given by Shri Chaturvedi that you need to have a bomb to express technological security. It cannot be taken seriously by any serious security analyst in the world. Some of the newspapers which Shri Chaturvedi quoted have also mentioned that the CIA is reported to have said that the Indians are very clever fellows. It is well known. Our capability is well known. If you feel that it is because of the bomb that you have demonstrated technological capability, then, I am afraid, you are using a wrong argument. *(Interruptions)*.

DR. GOPALRAO VITHALRAO PATIL (Maharashtra) : Was it not a modern technology? ..... *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH : I said, "Thermo nuclear low intensity explosion", I had been the Minister of Science and Technology and time and again I had said—I had said it on the floor of this House and I had said it in the Lok Sabha—that when we have given our scientists political support and resources, they have performed, whether it was developing new seeds or it was bio-technology. But, by the same token, you cannot say that the only achievement of Indian science is a nuclear explosion. If you mean it seriously, then...*(Interruptions)* Then, we shall look at any other arguments that you may have. The point that I am making is that the security analysis all over the world knows that you have this capability. So, to go around singing praises, to distribute sweets and to do all kinds of things, is in a way not being fair to Indian science. You have to accept the capabilities and the depth of Indian science. And it is not something which was discovered three weeks ago. It is a part of a more general system. India has the capability to do whatever it wants to do. That is the issue and to make it a smaller issue, with due respect, is something for which we, at least, need an explanation from you. This is my argument and I think that good sense would go by this.

Now, the other argument, of course, is the nuclear deterrence programme, so used by our friend, the Defence Minister. There again we are not getting a clear picture. So, I don't know how to respond. Mr. Kuldip Nayyar was very, very clear in his response. We have said, at some stage, that we are not going to enter into an arms race. And other people make the statement: "Our field divisions have tactical weapons." Now, my very dear friend, who is a great Indian, one of the greatest men, Mr. Abdul Kalam, of course, has said that he can manufacture the Agni, mass manufacture it. There is no question about that. He can do it. But are you saying, in the sense in which I have defined "security', that you are going to have tactical weapons for your field divisions? Don't say it using that word. Please give us an indication of what you have in mind. Otherwise, you are using words 'national

security', calculus of national security' sacrifice *karo* and all that, but we have not been given the most elementary dimension of India's security interests. If you don't mean it, then what have you done? I mean, one is not quite clear what this calculus is all about. If you mean security in the sense in which the Prime Minister's phrase 'calculus of national security' is, if it is defined in the security literature or the way these young fellows, whom we have hired from the JNU like Kanti Vajpayee, say on T.V. and so on they are all great darlings of the ruling alliance; I am happy that I brought them back from foreign Universities to JNU if you mean it in that sense, then you have to be very clear with what calculus means; you should be in a position to negotiate.

A conflict of interests does not mean that you cannot negotiate. Well, not everybody is saying that. There are people, very, very senior people who say, "He is enemy No. 1, he is enemy No. 2." We all know that the Mekong River Commission was set up by six countries which fought wars with each other Thailand with Cambodia, China with Vietnam and yet they negotiated and they agreed on how to share the great river. Madam Vice-Chairman, conflict of interests does not mean that you are not wanting to negotiate...

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Thank God, at least now, you remembered that there is a Chair in the House.

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH: When the President, Mr. Jiang Zamin came here, I was the Minister who was coordinating his visit at that time. He used the expression 'strategic relationship'. It is not that we do not know that they have divisions across and that they do not know that we have divisions here. It is not that we do not know that there were conflicts. But when two big countries like India and China agreed that their troops would withdraw across the Line of Control a 100 kms. back on both the sides, this was a very great advance.

The Chief Minister of Punjab, Shri Prakash Singh Badal, was very excited that we can have power transfer with Pakistan or that we can have agricultural trade with Pakistan. When I was the Power Minister I was very excited that we could have trade with Pakistan. You can negotiate from positions of strength. Now the quesiton is : what is your strategy? I think Mr. Manmohan Singh is absolutely right in saying that you have to give us some dimension....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): I rang the bell because you are addressing them, you are not addressing the chair.

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH: Madam, that is my fault. Madam Chairperson, you must ask them to give us some indication as to what they have in mind. Now the economic thing is amazing. I am a great admirer of George Fernandes because he is a socialist; ... *(Interruptions)*... he was a socialist. Anyway, I am a great admirer of him. But the point is when he takes those two lines from the Draft plan, from the Approach Paper approved by the NDC, in which I had written as Planning Minister that the State of Bihar's per capita income has gone down and that in the State of U.P. the per capita income is constant,... the Plan makes the argument... we have to have a plan for the agricultural transformation of Bihar and U.P., for infrastructural development in those States, for basic minimum services in those States. I would say with humility that I have just chaired a committee, which the Prime Minister has set up, to give an operational plan for the Eastern regions which your economic survey has talked about. Now to use those arguments, it really hurts us. When you use those arguments, an argument for funding a nuclear bomb, and so on we have to be very clear that all the options that you have. ..*(Interruptions)*... Now this is not a laughing matter, Mr. Chaturvedi, Mr. Malkani.

SHRI K.R. MALKANI (DELHI). No, we are not laughing at you. We are laughing at your lecturing. You are acting as a professor.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: He did n't mean that.

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: The point is, ...

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH: This is my point. If you don't understand it, it is your problem. I will be very happy to do a separate seminar for you, Mr. Malkani. It will be my pleasure. If you don't understand it, come out ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: Excuse me for saying it. When you were the Minister, you used to give a lecture as if you were in a classroom.

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH: That is not a problem. Come to the point, I will be happy to hear you. I will be very happy to hold a special seminar for you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Professor, this is the reason why I told you...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, if people are found to be ignorant ...*(Interruptions)*... What to do?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Mr. Alagh, will you please conclude now?

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH: I will just take two minutes. The whole question of sanctions is not connected with the aid. The aid part of it is unimportant. Even a small State Government, even the Municipal Corporation of Ahmedabad, has resources which are more than the aid that some countries give us. The issue of sanctions being used to stop bank guarantees is important.

When the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation floats a loan, there is a bank which gives a bank guarantee. In the entire infrastructure sector project after project is going to be held up if these sanctions are taken up seriously. But again, I believe India has the capability to overcome any obstacles. There, I agree with Shri Triloki Nath Chaturvedi. but it will not do good for the Government to say that रुपए का प्रोब्लम तो कोई प्रोब्लम नहीं है, सैंक्शन का प्रोब्लम कुछ नहीं है, हम सोल्व करेंगे। When the Chinese invaded India, the then Government told us, "We will double the defence expenditure and your income tax rate will go up. You have to pay the following things." If they have a strategy, then they have to tell us what they are talking. The Economic Survey says that. It says that the process of reform will be seriously endangered unless you make sacrifices. Now, what are you talking about? I think this is a very cavalier attitude that funding will come. If you have a defence strategy, if you have a security strategy, then it is in that context that, maybe, you can even ask people to make sacrifices. But there has to be a dimensional view and that is what we are not getting. You know France is a country which had handled individually, and while I was a Minister I was with President Chirac when he came from Bombay to Delhi and this whole notion that France is supporting us in the sense in which the Treasury Benches are talking about is simply not correct. Yes, they are not employing sanctions. But they are saying that you must develop a strategic relationship with them. The whole question of nuclear energy was something which I negotiated with France and they said that they would supply this but only if we develop a relationship with them. Now, if you think that you can keep on living in your own world and yet develop a relationship with the rest of the world, then I think there are a lot of difficulties. So, both internally and externally we need far more clarity, we need some options of what the Government is talking about rather than these very, very general kinds of statements, before they ask for solidarity.

Again I will end with the though that I am very confident that this great country of mine, whatever difficulties it is put into, has the capability and the resilience to overcome them.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (कुमारी सरोज खापर्डे): नीलोत्पल जी, अगर आपकी इजाज़त हो तो मैं एक बात कहूं? इस पूरी लिस्ट में एक ही महिला का नाम है। क्या मैं कमला जी को आपसे पहले बोलने के लिए बुलाऊं? आपको कोई ऐतराज़ तो नहीं होगा?

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु (पश्चिमी बंगाल): मैडम, दोनों को ही बोलने का मौका मिलेगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (कुमारी सरोज खापर्डे): आपको भी मिलेगा। जॉन फर्नांडिस को भी मिलेगा, सबको मौका मिलेगा।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: मतलब इसको जेंडर दृष्टिकोण से.....

उपसभाध्यक्ष (कुमारी सरोज खापर्डे): नहीं, नहीं, ऐसी बात नहीं है। मैंने इसीलिए आपसे पहले पूछा। .. (व्यवधान)...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: No, no. I don't want to show any chivalry also.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): She is not in a hurry. She never told me anything. I just thought, if you permit here I will ask her to speak. *(Interruptions)* ओ. के. नीलोत्पल जी, आप बोलिए : नहीं ....नहीं....., अब आप बोलिए। No. She doesn't want to speak now.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: No, no, Mdam, I have no problem. I have already conceded. I was saying that on such a small matter you should not invoke the gender logic.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): No, I am not invoking anything.

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: Who do I thank first? My brother, Nilotpal or Madam Chairperson?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Nilotpalji.

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: Thank you, Nilotpal. By the order of the Chair I thank you first.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Okay.

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा: उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, यह बहस कल से शुरू हुई है। भारतवर्ष ने न्यूक्लीयर बम एक्सप्लोड किया। जवाब में पाकिस्तान ने भी बम एक्सप्लोड किया।

हम बराबर हो गए। बम एक्सप्लोड करने से पहले हमारे रक्षा मंत्री का बयान आ रहा था। अखबारों में हमने इनका बयान पढ़ा। इन्होंने कहा कि इनको टेलीविज़न देखने को मौका नहीं मिलता है, रेडियो सुनने का मौका नहीं मिलता है। हमें भी नहीं मिलता है। शायद क्योंकि हम पुराने ज़माने में एक दल के साथ रहे इसलिए एक ही बीमारी से ग्रसित हैं। तो अखबार में हमने यह पढ़ा। अखबारों में कई तरह के बयान आते रहे। विदेश मंत्रालय के नाम से कुछ लोग बयान देते रहे। रक्षा मंत्री का बयान, किसी और का बयान, गृह मंत्री का बयान लेकिन मंत्री का या प्रधान मंत्री का कोई बयान नहीं था और अचानक एक विस्फोट हो गया।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी) पीठासीन हुए।]

ऐसा लगता था कि यह सरकार विभिन्न भाषाओं में, विभिन्न दिशाओं में बात कर रही है। अब बम विस्फोट तो हो गया। पहले हमें कहा जाता था India, Pakistan and Israel are the threshold countries. We are not a member of the Nuclear Club. Where are we now? What is our status? We are not yet included in the Nuclear Club. We are still at the doorstep. We are not at the threshold. Maybe we are at the doorstep. लेकिन हमें यह कहा जाता था और हम जानते हैं कि भारतवर्ष एक महान देश है। क्या हमारी महानता न्यूक्लीयर बम विस्फोट करने से दो-चार डिग्री बढ़ गई है? या पाकिस्तान के बम विस्फोट करने से क्या वह हमारे बराबर हो गया है? अखण्ड भारत का जो नारा रहा है जनसंघ और बी.जे.पी. का, क्या हम लोग उसके नज़दीक चले गए हैं? यही मैं पूछना चाहती हूं। कुछ प्रश्नों का निराकरण होना आवश्यक है। हम जानते हैं कि आज की दुनिया में केवल बम से कोई देश बड़ा नहीं होता है। जर्मनी के पास कोई बम नहीं है, न्यूक्लीयर बम नहीं है, जापान के पास कोई न्यूक्लीयर बम नहीं है लेकिन यह दोनों देश शक्तिशाली देश हैं, आर्थिक दृष्टि से शक्तिशाली हैं, दुनिया के नेता हैं। और हम बम बनाकर महान देश बनने चले हैं। अभी कई साथियों ने कहा, अलघ जी ने भी इसकी चर्चा की – 18 मार्च तक यूनाइटिड फ्रंट की सरकार थी। उस समय तक सरकार के सामने कोई थ्रैट परसैप्शन नहीं था। We were in the Ministry we were in the Government, but there was no threat perception whatsoever at that time. जियांग जैमिन - प्रैज़ीडेंट ऑफ चाइना आए, यहां वार्तालाप हुआ, स्ट्रैटेजिक डिस्कशन हुए, समझौते हुए। पाकिस्तान के साथ फॉर दी फर्स्ट टाइम, हमारे पड़ौसी देशों के साथ भारत के संबंधों में सुधार हुआ था। माले में सार्क कंट्रीज़ का जो सम्मेलन हुआ, उसमें दोनों देशों के प्रधान मंत्री, भारत और पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री मिले और आपस में समझौतों के जरिए सभी मसलों को हल करने का निर्णय हुआ था। बातें चल रही थीं, समझौते की दृष्टि से बातें चल रही थीं। यूनाइटिड नेशंस में पिछले साल जनरल असैम्बली में प्रधान मंत्री इंद्र कुमार गुजराल न कहा था कि यह हमारा मसला है, हम किसी तीसरी शक्ति को बीच में नही लाना चाहते। हम आपस में बात करके फैसला करेंगे। जो भी हमारे मतभेद हैं, उनको आपस में बैठकर फैसला करके मिटाएंगे। नवाज़ शरीफ साहब के साथ जब ऐडिनबरा में चोगम कॉन्फ्रैंस में बात हुई थी तो मैं भी उस समय वहां उपस्थित थी। उन्होंने कहा था कि भाई साहब, मसला कुछ नहीं है। आप और हम अगर आपस में बैठें तो सब मसला हल हो जाएगा। हम चाहते हैं कि मसला हल हो जाए। लेकिन यहां तो हमें एक साइकोसिस तैयार करना है। यह हिन्दु का देश है, हिन्दुत्व का देश है और बाकी जो दूसरे लोग हैं, उनके लिए यहां जगह नहीं

है। यह एक विचित्र किस्म का साइकोसिस तैयार करना है। मैं समझती हूं कि पॉलिटिकली मोटिवेटिड होकर इस सारी बात को किया गया है। हमारे रक्षा मंत्री जी चले गये हैं, शायद उन्हें और कोई काम होगा। मैं आपको कहना चाहती हूं कि उन्होंने अपने बयान में मयनमार के बारे में भी कहा कि मयनमार के साथ भी हमारा बॉर्डर है, हमारी सीमा रेखा है और उसमें भी हमें खतरा हैं हमें मालूम है। मयनमार में फौजी जुंटा की हकुमत है लेकिन उनके साथ भी हमारे संबंधों में बहुत सुधार हुआ था। शायद आपमें से बहुत से लोगों को मालूम होगा कि पिछले दिनों यूनाइटिड फ्रंड की सरकार ने हमने पहले पहल बुद्धिस्ट कंट्रीज़ को एक साथ एक आर्थिक विकास के जरिए लाने की कोशिश की जिसको कहा जाता है – बिमस्टिक (बी॰आई॰एम॰एस॰टी॰ई॰सी॰) बंगलादेश, इंडिया, म्यामार, श्रीलंका और थाइलैंड – इकनॉमिक कोआपरेशन हुई थी और एक साथ लेकर विकास का काम करने का हम लोगों ने काम शुरू कर दिया था। फॉर दी फर्स्ट टाइम मयनमार ने यह तय किया था कि मयनमार के जंगलों में अपने यहां से जो उग्रवादी जाकर पनाह लेते थे, उनको पनाह नहीं लेने देंगे। यह यूनाइटिड फ्रंड की सरकार में हुआ था। देहात में एक कहावत है कि "आ बैल मुझे मार" सिंह पकड़कर आप कह रहे हैं कि आ, तूं मुझे मार नहीं तो मैं तुझे मारूंगा। नाहक का झगड़ा मोल ले रहे हैं। किस दुनिया में हैं आप? चाइना के पास न्यूक्लीयर कैपेबिलिटी आज से नहीं बहुत दिन पहले से हैं। कई लोगों ने इसको पहले भी कहा है, मैं उसको दोहराना नहीं चाहती हूं। चाइना हमसे कई गुणा बड़ा देश है। ...(व्यवधान).. अच्छी बात है, दोगुना बड़ा है, आप ही हिसाब जोड़ लीजिए। चाइना हमसे भौगोलिक दृष्टि से भी बड़ा देश है, फौज की दृष्टि से भी बड़ा देश है। लेकिन कल्चरली सारी दुनिया यह मानती है कि भारतवर्ष, लारजेस्ट डेमोक्रेसी इन दा वर्ल्ड और चाइना ये दोनों देश अगर एक साथ एक नजरिए से काम करें तो these are the two great countries of Asia and the world. हम यह कर सकते थे लेकिन आपने उस हालात को बिगाड़ दिया। ... (व्यवधान)... यह जो नई सरकार आई है उसने। यह कहा जाता है कि अरे दुनिया की बात से हमें क्या लेना देना है हम तो अब न्यूक्लियर पावर कंट्री हो गए। इकानामिक सेक्शन से हमें कोई देना नहीं है। चीन को देखो चीन ने भी इसे नहीं माना। ...(व्यवधान)...

प्रो॰ राम बक्श सिंह वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश): 1962 में चाइना ने हमला कर दिया भारत पर उसमें आपका क्या दोष था?

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा: 1962 में और आज में बहुत अन्तर है....

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): कमला जी, अभी आपको अपनी बात कहनी है, उनकी बात का जवाब देने से क्या फायदा।

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा: आप उनको चुप कराइये। मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि यह बात ठीक है कि इकानामिक सेक्शन का चीन पर कोई असर नहीं पड़ा क्योंकि उसके कई कारण थे। एक कारण यह था कि चाइनीज जो डाइसपोरा में हैं, जो विदेशों में रहते हैं वे उनको रुपया भेजते हैं चीन के पास 80 प्रतिशत रुपया बाहर से आता है जिसको चाइनीज इन डाइसपोरा भेजते हैं और हमारा only two per cent of our FDI comes from NRIs. इसमें बहुत अन्तर है। बात कही जा सकती है लेकिन इसको करने में बहुत कठिनाइयां हैं। चीन के साथ हमारे रिश्तों में काफी सुधार हुआ था, व्यापार बढ़ा था, इंडो-चीन ट्रेड रिलेशन में काफी बढ़ोत्तरी हुई थी। 50 ज्वाईंट वेंचर्स खुले थे लेकिन हम लोगों ने एक धमाके से इतिहास को पीछे कर दिया।

मैं कहना चाहती हूं कि यहां पर कई लोगों ने कई उद्धरण दिए। पण्डित नेहरू के बारे में कहा, इन्दिरा गांधी जी ने क्या कहा उसके बारे में कहा और प्रधान मंत्री जी ने खुद अपने वक्तव्य में इन बातों को कहा है। मैं पण्डित नेहरू जी का एक उद्धरण कहना चाहती हूं। एक पुरानी किताब है और उस किताब को जिन्होंने लिखा है उनमें से एक व्यक्ति को दो-दो बार पीस नोबल प्राइज मिला है। मैं उस किताब में से कहना चाहती हूं। पण्डित जी ने 'न्यूक्लियर एक्सप्लोजन्स एंड देयर अफेक्ट्स' इस पुस्तक का फोरवर्ड लिखते हुए उन्होंने कहा था–

"I trust that this study, brief and incomplete as it is, will be of some use in directing people's mind to the dreadful prospects of war in the nuclear age and to the dangers of continuing explosions."

हीरोशिमा, नागासाकी की कहानी कही गई, गांधी जी की बात कही गई। हीरोशिमा और नागासाकी भारतवर्ष से बहुत दूर हैं और पाकिस्तान की सरहद बहुत नजदीक है। भारत की ज्योग्राफी को जिन्होंने अच्छी तरह से देखा होगा तो उन्होंने देखा होगा कि नार्थ-ईस्ट का जुड़ाव, मेन लाइन इण्डिया से जो जुड़ाव है वह बिल्कुल डेगर की तरह चीन का सरहद ऊपर से आया है और बहुत पतली सी जगह है जिसको नेरो केरीडोर हम कह सकते हैं। उसको अलग करने में कोई बहुत कठिनाई नहीं होगी, किसी भी न्यूक्लियर पावर वाले देश को और नार्थ-ईस्ट को आप बचा नहीं

सकेंगे। आप इस हालत में देश को मत ले जाइए। पालिटीकल कंसीडरेशन में जाकर देश को बरबादी के रास्ते पर आप मत ले जाइये। पाकिस्तान को तो यह करना ही था, हम जानते थे क्योंकि already we are a threshold nuclear power. We are a 'threshold' country.

हमें मालूम था कि पाकिस्तान के पास भी न्यूक्लियर पावर है, न्यूक्लियर नॉलेज है और हमारे पास भी था, सबको मालूम था, दुनिया के लोगों को, किसी से कोई छिपी हुई बात नहीं थी। अलघ जी ने आपको इन बातों को अच्छी तरह से बताया।

Being a scientist he explained everything to you.

लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि अब जब आप इस हालत में पहुंच गए हैं तब आपको रास्ता ढूंढना चाहिए कि हम निकले कैसे। शेर की सवारी करना आसान है लेकिन उतरना मुश्किल है, शेर ही निगल जाता है। इस देश को उस हालत में मत ले जाइये कि शेर की सवारी करके हम उतर ही न सकें और शेर हमें निगल जाए। आप यह कहते हैं कि देश को हमारा साथ देना चाहिए।

Nation should tighten its belt.

हमारे एक साथी ने कहा कि देने के लिए हमारे पास है ही क्या। जिन शब्दों का इस्तेमाल उन्होंने किया है मैं उनको दोहराना नहीं चाहूंगी। लेकिन बात तो सही है कि 50 फीसदी लोग जिस देश में अनपढ़ हों और जिस देश के 7 लाख गावों में से साढ़े तीन लाख गावों में पीने का पानी न हो, सड़कें न हों और कल जॉर्ज साहब ने कहा कि 58 फीसदी लोग इस देश में गरीबी रेखा के नीचे हैं तो उस देश को आप कहते हैं, to tighten your belt. There is no belt to tighten.

भूखे लोगों को .....(व्यवधान)

श्रीमती मालती शर्मा: सर, ...(व्यवधान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): जब आपका बोलने का मौका आए तब आप अपनी बात कहना। कमला जी, आपका 9 मिनट का टाइम था, जरा जल्दी समाप्त कीजिए।

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा: महोदय, मैं जल्दी समाप्त करूंगी। मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि इस देश को सही रास्ते पर ले जाने के लिए प्रधान मंत्री और सत्ता पक्ष के लोगों का यह प्रयास होना चाहिए कि एक नेशनल कन्सेन्सस बनाना चाहिए। इमिडिएटली आज जिस हालत में आपने हमें पहुंचा दिया है, न्यूक्लियर वारफेयर के दरवाजे पर पहुंचा दिया है और जिस तरह की भाषा आप बोल रहे हैं वह भाषा शांतिप्रिय देश के लोगों की भाषा नहीं हो सकती है। जिस भाषा का प्रयोग सरकार की ओर से, सरकारी बैंचों की ओर से किया जा रहा है, खासकर डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर की ओर से, वह भाषा उस देश की भाषा नहीं है जो शांति चाहता हो। भगवान के वास्ते इस देश को लड़ाई में मत उलझाइये। वह जमाना गया जब ग़ौरी लड़ने के लिए आया था और दूसरे लोग लूटने के लिए आये थे। पाकिस्तान से एक न्यूक्लियर वेपन्स आयेगा तो यहां क्या होगा? एक मैगजीन में इसके बारे में दिया है कि कनॉट प्लेस में क्या होगा, कहां-बरबादी होगी सारा इसमें दिया है। मैं इसकी सत्यता के बारे में नहीं कह सकती हूं कि कहां तक यह सत्य है लेकिन यह निश्चित है कि हिरोशिमा और नागासाकी में एक बम ने हैवक क्रिएट किया तो उससे यह अंदाजा लगाया जा सकता है कि कहीं से भी कोई बम आए चाहे उत्तरी सरहद से आये या पश्चिमी सरहद से आये तो यह देश तो बरबाद हो ही जाएगा। इस देश को बरबादी की ओर ले जाने का आपको कोई अधिकार नहीं है। महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से कहना चाहती हूं कि इस देश को बरबादी के रास्ते पर ले जाने के लिए, आधे से ज्यादा लोगों को मरवाने के लिए आपको कोई अधिकार नहीं है। हां, यह एक पॉलिसी हो सकती है कि,

India is an over-populated country.

अगर इनको पॉपुलेशन कंट्रोल करनी है तो यह सबसे आसान रास्ता है कि मरवा डालो देश के आधे लोगों को। अगर आपने तथा आपकी सरकार ने यह सोचा होगा तो

You are welcome to have your principles and your thoughts. But, the country does not conform to your principles and thoughts. You cannot lead this country like this. This country is a secular and democratic country and it is going to remain a secular and democratic country. Do not create a war psychosis here. I warn you. मैं एक बात और कहकर अपनी बात समाप्त करूंगी। दुनिया में जो शासक दल के लोग हैं केवल उन्हीं की बात नहीं है बल्कि दूसरी संस्था भी ऐसी हैं जो सैनर एलिमेंट हैं वो भी कह रहे हैं कि भारत ने जो कुछ किया है वह गलत है। सोशलिस्ट इन्टरनेशनल में 138 देशों के संस्था सदस्य हैं और 55 देशों में इनकी सरकार चल रही है। 55 देशों में सोशलिस्ट इन्टरनेशनल एफिलिएट्स की गवर्नमेंट्स है। पिछले दिनों नार्वे में नेशनल काउंसिल की जो मीटिंग हुई थी उसमें सोशलिस्ट इन्टरनेशनल ने 18-19 मई को एक रेजोल्यूशन पास किया था जिसमें उन्होंने

कहा था कि–

It condemns the nuclear tests which were carried out by India. These tests have serious implications for regional and global security and constitute a strong set back for international nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation efforts. इसके केवल यूरोप के देश ही सदस्य नहीं है बल्कि अफ्रीका के लोग भी इसके सदस्य हैं, सोशलिस्ट इंटरनेशनल में लेटिन अमेरिका के देश भी सदस्य हैं So, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, through you, I warn this Government that let a saner sense prevail upon it. Do not take this country to the Doom's Day. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: At the very outset, I must concede that I rise with a very heavy burden because especially from the Treasury Benches, time and again, it has been pointed out how CPI(M) has been the only party which does not agree with the tests at all. But, what has pained us most is the linkage, that that in itself is a proof of our unpatriotism. Our loyalty to the country has been questioned. This is what saddens us the most. I must also concede that this is not the way to build a national consensus for which the Prime Minister is so fervently appealing. Now, I must point out very specifically that our position on the tests is guided principally and exclusively by considerations of the security of this country. We do not buy this idea, this unidimensional equation, that a nuclear bomb is a foolproof arrangement for ensuring our national security. I did not agree with many of the formulations that Dr. B.B. Dutta was making earlier. But, one formulation that he has made begs questions of the Treasury Benches, and which till now they have not been able to properly respond to, that is, how the deterrnence that non-nuclear India was having was inferior to the deterrence that nuclear India will be having in the future.

[MR. CHAIRMAN *in the Chair*]

Mr. Chairman, Sir, Dr. Karan Singh has left. He thought that the whole question of timing was irrelevant to the debate. But, I think, that the question of timing remains valid, not because the detonation went off, but in the context of a certain exercise that has to be carried out in deciding whether we will induct nuclear weapons as a major element of our national security policy. Now the whole question is that the national security is a holistic concept. Nuclear bomb can be a very important element in that security policy. We do not disagree with that. But, it has to be integrated into what our foreign policy is and what our overall doctrine is. How does actual acquiring of a nuclear bomb strengthen our national security? That central question must be answered. We think that there has to be an absolute national consensus in this country. There has to be unity of political parties on this question. But, we should understand that we are not such fools that we will ask on which day you are going to detonate. But, what is the strategic review? It has to be pointed out that none of the political parties are unpatriotic as Mr. Margabandu thinks about those who are not supporting the Government today. Non of these political parties, in their wisdom, when they went to the elections, thought it wise to include this question in their political manifesto. But, after the elections when this exercise was on to evolve a national agenda for governance, they put it with a lot of caution. They said that they are going to discuss and review this whole thing and therefore, this strategic review is necessary. The question of timing assumes significance in the context of conducting those reviews. Actually, it was answered yesterday and placed on the Table of the House. I had put a question to the Defence Minister: Have you had a strategic review? He said "No, only a task force has been created and it will be done." Then you owe us an explanation. We are not asking about the time. Why did this strategic review become irrelevant in deciding the nuclear policy of this country? I put the question in a different context. We do not argue about the timing. You just said, what you have put in your National Agenda of governance became irrelevant in so far as deciding the nuclear option of the country is concerned. You tell us. We will be happy with your explanation. You have not told us. Then, is the strategic review irrelevant to the whole question of security policy of this country? Will the Prime Minister say while replying to this debate that strategic review is not irrelevant in terms of deciding about the nuclear option? If the Prime Minister says so, we will accept it.

But, I think no person in his right sense of mind can say so. Therefore, the question of timing becomes relevant. You have to answer this question.

Now, another major point has been missed out in the statement. Nobody was speaking on this. We are absolutely ignorant of our security issues. But, I think, the world over, security analyists and experts, have pointed out one thing, that nuclear weapon is not an arm for self-defence. It is a weapon which is not to be used at all. It is not to be used at all in that sense. That is the paradox that is inherent in the nuclear paradigm. Now, it has been stated in the statement of the Prime Minister—if you see Para No. 11, — these are weapons of self-defence. No country in its right sense of mind will say that a nuclear weapon is a weapon of self-defence. Will you retaliate with a nuclear bomb? I do not know what the Government is arguing. I think this is unacceptable to anybody. The whole question of futility of nuclear arms as a means of deterrence has been proved through this long 40 years of protracted cold war. The countries have tried. All these issues that we are debating have been debated out.

If conventional arms was not a real index of security, how could you explain the outcome of the American-Vietnam war? What was their population? What was the nuclear power of America? How is Cuba surviving on this map? How could they ensure their national security? Therefore, Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am afraid we are not in a position to buy this whole logic, this whole unidimensional emphasis on a nuclear bomb being the watertight safeguard for national security. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have pointed out very specifically that we do not agree with the approach that the Government is taking. Our point is that we have to behave as a mature nation. Kamlaji was explaining at length how the earlier Government functioned. Now, it is not that we have not heard the Defence Minister explaining to us in terms of referring to the documents that he has referred to, including the Standing Committee documents. We all know what the reality today is.

5.00 P.M.

But the issue today is, despite those realities, how will be proceed, in terms of deescalating the tension in our neighbourhood? How will we create a peaceful atmosphere so that we can pursue the development goals that we have set for ourselves?

We are not foolish enough to say that because poverty is there, because unemployment is there, no considerations of national security should be there. But the point is, the designing of our national security approach should be such that it also creates conducive conditions to address the problems of poverty, unemployment and so on and so forth.

SHRI NARENDRA MOHAN: Security and development go together.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: That is what we say.

A statement has been made by the Defence Minister on yesterday's blasts by Pakistan. It has been charged that the tests are India-specific. True; absolutely true. I use this opportunity to condemn what happened in Pakistan yesterday. But may I ask: how can we delink yesterday's blasts with what happened on the 11th and 13th of May?

Now, everybody knew. As Prof. Alagh has pointed out, we all know that many countries are having nuclear weapons. But what is vital is the final political decision, when you press the button to go nuclear.

Now it is true that our actions have triggered off a process. We do not know what will happen tomorrow. The Defence Minister's statement says that this has been factored into our defence preparedness. This also begs elaboration. What will be our response, if it is part of our defence preparedness? What kind of bombs they have exploded? How will you respond? What will be our response, in nuclear terms? I say this because you are equating security only with the upgradation of your nuclear facility. If that is not arms race, what else is arms race? You have to answer the question. I am sorry. I am afraid. You will have to answer this question.

You have to explain another thing also. Yesterday, the Defence Minister was very kind enough to waste one hour of the precious time of the House while sharing his metamorphosis from a pacifist to the kind of language that he

speaks today. He mentioned that immediately after the discussion on CTBT was over, he saw—as one would have said in the days of enlightenment—the light—that the peace thing could no more be there and there has to be some kind of nuclearisation of the country so that we break the monopoly of the nuclear 'haves'.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Prime Minister has arrived. I want to put just one question to him. Speaker after speaker from the treasury benches said that we have broken the nuclear monopoly, with the blasts that we have conducted on the 11th and 13th May. Is it a fact that we have broken the nuclear monopoly? Is it a fact that no situation of discrimination remains in the world, in terms of access to nuclear powers?

I think, Sir, when we are discussing such an important issue, we must not indulge in self-delusion. We must act as mature politicians. We should not equate ourselves with Pakistan. we know what kind of political system is there. That is why, all the more, we were apprehensive. To us, more than the nuclear tests, what is a more dangerous signal is the suspension of whatever semblance of a Constitution they had; the Emergency rule that they have established there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Basu, you have to conclude now.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Just two minutes, Sir.

प्रो॰ विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा: पार्टियों का टाइम तय था। उसमें हमारी पार्टी का टाइम भी बचा हुआ है। यहां तो अभी कांग्रेस पार्टी के भी बचे हुए हैं। इसलिए या तो सबको टाइम दें.. परंतु प्रधान मंत्री जी को आपने पांच बजे आने के लिए कहा था ..(व्यवधान) तो यह आखिर कब तक होगा

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: चेयरमैन साहब, मैं दो मिनट में खत्म कर दूंगा।

प्रो॰ विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा: अगर ये सब बोले तो हमारे लोगों का भी बोलना बाकी है।

श्री सभापति: अभी कुछ का बाकी है। आपका पूरा हो गया, कुछ का बाकी है। पूरा करके दूंगा।

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, I will take just two minutes to wind up. I am winding up.

My point is that some time back in Maharashtra some people said that they would not permit some artists from Pakistan to perform. We thought that this was the way to assert our strength. Shabanaji is sitting here. We have read in the Press reports that a similar *fatwa* was given for her programme there. This is a mad slanging-match we are indulging ourselves in.

Always, armed forces had a major role to play in the decision-making process in Pakistan. I cannot draw a nightmarish picture unlike what Kamlaji does. No power in the world today will be there to throw a nuclear bomb. The point is we have given a handle to a fanatic, militarist leadership to gain control over the political process in Pakistan. However the Prime Minister may say that we will not start an arms race, the arms race has started. However we may say that we will have good neighbourly relations with Pakistan and China, that the other Governments, the previous Government, have tried for it and that there is continuity in our foreign policy, that is not going to be there because we have irrevocably changed the foreign policy paradigm of this country.

Therefore, to conclude, Sir, I would fervently appeal, through you, to the Prime Minister that now is not the time to go in for slanging matches of this kind. It does not serve any purpose. These are two nuclear-weapon countries. Let us take advantage of some of the openings that have been created in terms of talks and in terms of reconciliation. We have to do that we also two developing countries.

All this America-baiting is going on here in the House. If we objectively look at the developments in the last 20 days, it is a win-win situation for America. The Defence Minister has already said in the House, "We have to sign the CTBT. Therefore, we have done this." It is there on record. The shift in the situation of India withstanding the pressure to sign the CTBT to India and Pakistan signing the CTBT will be a major gain for Americans. The whole process of India and China, two great countries, two great civilisations, coming together is getting disrupted. This is a big gain for the American game plan in this entire Asian theatre.

Therefore, Sir, at the end, sharing the same kind of concern for national security that

everybody else has in the House, sharing the same kind of patriotism that everybody else in the House has, we say that this is the time to reflect, and this is the time for conciliation. I think in the morning there was an excellently-delivered fervent appeal made by the Leader of the Opposition. If the Government lays bare a package, on the basis of that the nation can stand by it, and we can bring an end to this madness.

श्री भुवनेश चतुर्वेदी (राजस्थान): सभापति जी, बहुत भारी मन के साथ आज इस विषय पर बोलने का मुझे अवसर मिला है। प्रधान मंत्री जी मुझे याद है जब 1974 में इंदिरा जी के समय में विस्फोट हुआ था और आप लोक सभा में भाषण दे रहे थे। मैं उस समय लोक सभा की गैलरी में था, लेकिन उत्सुकतावश लाइब्रेरी में जाकर आप के उस भाषण को मैंने पढ़ा और यह भी संयोग है कि आज प्रधान मंत्री जी आप यहां उपस्थित हैं। आज मैं आप को आप की ही कही बात याद दिलाना चाहता हूं उन दो लाइंस को मैं पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूं जोकि इस तरह हैं–

"वैज्ञानिकों ने अपना कर्त्तव्य किया, अब राजनेता कसौटी पर कसे जा रहे हैं। वे सफल होते हैं या नहीं यह आने वाला कल ही बताएगा।"

मैं उम्मीद करता हूं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी को यह बात याद होगी। देश को यह बात याद है और सब से बड़ी परीक्षा की घड़ी आप की ही है क्योंकि निर्णय आप ने ही लिया है। मान्यवर, हमारे पूरे आजादी के आंदोलन में हम जिस आदर्श के लिए खड़े रहे, वह आज झुठलाया जा रहा है। स्वयं प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो स्टेटमेंट और डॉक्युमेंट पेश किया, उस में कहा था–

"It, in a sense, still remains the natural course for a country that had waged a unique struggle for independence on the basis of Ahinsa and Satyagraha."

यह बहुत प्रसन्नता की बात है कि जो लोग गांधी जी को राष्ट्रपिता कहने में शर्माते हैं, हिचकिचाते हैं, वह गांधी जी की बात को कोट करते हैं। मुझे अटल जी से कभी यह शिकायत नहीं, लेकिन उन के कार्यकर्ताओं और अति-उत्साही समर्थकों में यह कमी पाई जाती है। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि उनके मित्र, उन के समर्थक अगर सच्चे समर्थक हैं तो उन्हें अपने नेता की बात को याद रखना चाहिए कि गांधी जी ने क्या कहा था। मैं आप को याद दिलाना चाहता हूं कि 1962 में जब गांधी पीस फाउंडेशन ने जवाहर लाल नेहरु द्वारा पूरी तरह से उत्साहित किए जाने के बाद राजगोपालाचारी जी और दिवाकर जी को अमेरिका भेजा, ढ़ेभर भाई और रामचन्द्रन जी को यूरोप भेजा तो कैनेडी वहां के राष्ट्रपति थे, आप को याद होगा कि उन्होंने राजाजी का किस सम्मान के साथ स्वागत किया और किस सम्मान के साथ उन की बात को सुना। अब यह कहना तो अतिशयोक्ति होगी कि उन के मिलने के कारण या उन के कहे के कारण उन्होंने अमेरिका द्वारा किए जाने वाले टैस्ट को कुछ दिनों के लिए रोक दिया, लेकिन यह भी एक कारण है कि राजाजी की प्रतिभा ने उस नौजवान राष्ट्रपति को प्रभावित किया और अमेरिका के जो टैस्ट प्रोग्राम्स थे, उन्हें कुछ दिनों के लिए रोका।

मान्यवर, आप देश को सर्वानुमति से चलाना चाहते हैं, आप का स्वागत है, लेकिन मुझे इस बात का दुख होता है कि पाकिस्तान ने जब एक्सप्लोजन किया, उसी रात को हमारे राजदूत को उन्होंने वहां के विदेश मंत्रालय में बुलाया और उन्हें कहा गया कि 'आप हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण कर रहे हैं।' आप ने या आप की सरकार ने यह बात देश और संसद से छिपाई। यह ट्रांसपिरेंसी नहीं है। यह बात समझनी चाहिए थी कि अगर रात के एक बजे हमारे राजदूत को पाकिस्तान की सरकार बुला रही है तो कहीं-न-कहीं गड़बड़ है... I... यह हम को समझना चाहिए था और यह हम को एंटीसिपेट करना चाहिए था। मुझे दुख है कि यह बात देश के सामने नहीं कही गयी और यह कही जानी चाहिए थी। जब आप सर्वानुमति की बात करते हैं तो आप को देश के सामने यह वायदा करना पड़ेगा। हमारी पार्टी ही नहीं देश की सभी पार्टियां राष्ट्र-सम्मान को सर्वोपरि मानती हैं। राष्ट्र सम्मान या राष्ट्र भक्ति का कोई ठेका ले तो वह अनुचित है। आज हम ने जो कुछ एचीव किया है, उसे पूरा देश बड़े स्वाभिमान के साथ देखता है। लेकिन बम तो सभी कुछ नहीं है। जैसा कि आप ने कहा कि 'राजनेता अब कसौटी पर है,' मेरा आप से निवेदन है कि आप पूरे देश को विश्वास में लें। बम बिस्फोट तो हो गया, लेकिन अब इस के बाद आप की क्या योजना है? क्या आप ईमानदारी से कह सकते हैं कि आप के सामने थ्रेट परसेप्शंस हैं? क्या आप कह सकते हैं कि पाकिस्तान से आप को खतरा था? मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि पिछले 10-15 सालों में जो विदेश नीति चली है, उस में आज कोई यह नहीं कहता कि चीन ने हमारी जमीन नहीं दबाई, कोई यह नहीं कहता कि 1962 में हमारा झगड़ा नहीं हुआ,कोई यह नहीं कहता कि इस देश का बंटवारा हुआ और पाकिस्तान भी इस देश का एक हिस्सा था, लेकिन अब ये बात क्यों उठाई जाती है, आप के साथी, आप के मंत्रिमंडल के लोग कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान जिस जमीन पर चाहे, जिस समय

725/PMR/99 - /m

चाहे लड़ाई लड़ सकता है। यह मैं ने खुद टेलिविजन पर सुना है। आप इन के कॉंट्राडिक्शंस पर भरोसा मत कीजिए, यह मैं आप को कहना चाहता हूं और दूसरी बात, जॉर्ज साहब जो डा॰ लोहिया के परम भक्त माने जाते हैं, हालांकि उन्होंने अपने हर नेता को डिसओन किया है। जैसा चौधरी चरण सिंह जी के समय मुरार जी भाई को भी आपने डिसओन किया है। यह सब इतिहास है। मैं आपको निवेदन करता हूं कि यह जो इंडो-पाक फेडरेशन की बात है, यह डा॰ लोहिया का ही सपना है। आज इस सपने को सबसे पहले किसने तोड़ा? जॉर्ज फर्नांडिस साहब ने तोड़ा। पाकिस्तान से जिस तरह की दुश्मनी आज इन्होने पैदा की है, वैसी कभी नहीं थी। चीन से जैसी दुश्मनी इस सरकार ने पैदा की है, जॉर्ज फर्नांडिस साहब ने पैदा की है, पिछले इतने सालों में कभी ऐसी नहीं हुई। मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि आपको वादा करना पड़ेगा देश के सामने, अगर आप सर्वानुमति की बात करना चाहते हैं तो देश को विश्वास में लेना पड़ेगा। यह नहीं कि पोकरण की बालू रेत लेकर तमाम देश में घूमते फिरेंगे। जिसने आपको मुखौटा कहा, उसी ने राजस्थान में भारतीय जनता पार्टी की बैठक में यह फैसला करवाया कि हम इस रेत को लेकर घूमेंगे, हम शक्ति-स्थल बनाएंगे। मैं आपसे यह कहता हूं कि अगर आपको मंदिर ही बनाना है तो जरूर बनाइए, वहां आप बनाइए भाभा की स्मृति में पारसियों का मंदिर, वहां बनाइए डा॰ अब्दुल कलाम के विश्वास की मस्जिद, जिससे आपका उससे पश्चाताप भी हो जाएगा कि आपने बाबरी मस्जिद तोड़ी। जैसा आपने कहा था कि मैं शर्मिन्दा हूं, देश शर्मिन्दा है। तो मैं आपसे निवेदन करता हूं कि आइए, वहां पारसियों का मंदिर बनाइए, वहां एक मस्जिद बनाइए और उसमें शक्तिपीठ भी हो जो जाए तो उसमें दिक्कत नहीं है, लेकिन ईमानदारी से सब धर्मों को लेकर आपको चलना पड़ेगा। आपके सामने कुछ वायदे हैं, जो देश के सामने आपको करने हैं, अगर आप समर्थन चाहते हैं। देश का सम्मान तो हम भी चाहते हैं, हम भी सम्मान रखते हैं, लेकिन आपको यह वायदा करना पड़ेगा कि आप ट्रांसपेरेन्सी से देश को चलाएंगे, यह नहीं कि ग्रेट परसेप्शन जॉर्ज साहब का अलग, खुराना साहब का अलग और आपका अलग होगा। इससे देश नहीं चलने वाला है।

महोदय, अगली बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आपने देश में एक नई स्थिति पैदा कर दी है। अब आपको यह वायदा करना पड़ेगा कि इस झगड़े के बीच में आप किसी तीसरी शक्ति को चौधरी नहीं बनाएंगे। ऐसा नहीं कि कहीं आप हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के झगड़े में किसी तीसरी ताकत को चौधरी बनाएं या कहीं आप हिन्दुस्तान और चीन के झगड़े में किसी तीसरे को चौधरी बनाएं। यह आपको वायदा करना पड़ेगा कि आप तीसरी शक्ति को चौधरी नहीं बनाएंगे क्योंकि हम क्षमता रखते हैं और ईमानदारी रखते हैं। हम में शक्ति है, समझदारी है, हम आपस में अपने झगड़े तय कर सकते हैं।

महोदय, मैं आपको कहता हूं कि आपको यह वायदा करना पड़ेगा। पाकिस्तान हमारे से ज्यादा चतुर साबित हुआ है उसने समझदारी बताई और भारत से बातचीत के लिए कहा। आपको याद होगा, 1974 में जब बम एक्सप्लोजन हुआ ....(व्यवधान).... अरे, उनकी समझदारी की बात है। शैम शैम, क्या बातें करते हो। आप देश को पागलपन की तरफ ले जा रहे हैं। आप इस बात को समझिए और देश को उन्माद की तरफ मत ले जाइए। मैं आपसे निवेदन करता हूं, यह ऐतिहासिक सत्य है। आपने चीन के प्रधानमंत्री को चिट्ठी नहीं लिखी, आपने पाकिस्तान के प्रधानमंत्री को चिट्ठी नहीं लिखी। आपको याद होगा, 1974 में जब यह एक्सप्लोजन हुआ तो इंदिरा जी ने बांगला देश की लड़ाई के बाद भी भुट्टो साहब को चिट्ठी लिखी और उन्होंने कहा, मैंने यह नोट किया हुआ था, उन्होंने कहा कि हम पाकिस्तान के साथ न्युक्लीयर टैक्नोलोजी में कोपरेशन चाहते हैं। इंदिरा जी ने यह कहा है वर्ष 1974 में। आपके सलाहकारों ने क्यों नहीं कहा कि जो कुछ हुआ, हो गया, लेकिन चीन को और पाकिस्तान को भी हमराह बनाएंगे। आपको यह जिओ पोलिटिकल कंपलसन को भी समझना होगा। You cannot operate in isolation. भारत को जो भूगोल और जो इतिहास ने जिस स्थिति में रखा है, उसको आपको समझना पड़ेगा।

महोदय, मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी का, सदन का अधिक समय नहीं लूंगा, लेकिन यह बात जरूर कहूंगा कि बहुत कुछ आपको करना है। उन्माद को आप दबाइए। पिछले एक्सप्लोजन के बाद बी॰जे॰पी॰ की रैली हो रही है। क्यों बी॰जे॰पी॰ की रैली हो रही है? क्या बी॰जे॰पी॰ ने यह किया है? अगर करना ही है तो देश को जगाइए। आपने तय कर लिया था कि बंगलौर में बी॰जे॰पी॰ की रैली करेंगे। क्यों बंगलौर में आप रैली करेंगे? आप इसको बी॰जे॰पी॰ का इश्यू मत बनाइए वरना घाटे में रहेंगे आप? आपको पूरे देश को साथ में लेना है तो बी॰जे॰पी॰ के नाम से यह सब नहीं चलेगा। आपके पास तो मैण्डेट ही नहीं है, इतने बड़े फैसले के लिए। जब तक पूरा देश आपके साथ नहीं होगा, आपके पास देश को नया मोड़ देने के लिए मैण्डेट नहीं है।

यह बात आपको समझनी पड़ेगी, समझनी चाहिए। नम्बर का भी गेम नहीं है लेकिन फिर भी मैंडेट आपको नहीं है। इसलिए अगर देश को साथ रखना है तो ये वादे

आपको करने पड़ेंगे–ट्रांसपिरेंसी का वादा करना पड़ेगा, कोई तीसरी महाशक्ति देश के इस झगड़े में दखल न करे इसका वादा करना पड़ेगा और दलगत राजनीति से आप इस ईश्यू को टैकल नहीं करेंगे, यह वादा करना पड़ेगा।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात को समाप्त करता हूं।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, the hon. Prime Minister.

श्री सनातन बिसि (उड़ीसा): सर, हमको कहा गया था बोलने के लिए।...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, with a heavy heart, I want to put on record the contents of the discussion we had with you in your Chamber regarding distribution of time and rotation of speakers. That thing is now not being taken care of. I cannot use the word 'violated', Sir, because the Chair cannot violate. The Chair is above all rules. But I only want to say that this has not happened in this House before. The names of the speakers were there. Sir, You had seen the list of the speakers. The Prime Minister is a very important person. I understand that. But there may be some Members in the House who have not spoken and they would like to speak and suggest to him as to what should be done at the present time. I only say that this has never taken place in this House. It is for you to decide.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, I know that there are still so many Members who want to speak. (*Interruptions*)

श्री सनातन बिसि : चेयरमैन साहब, हमको बोला गया था कि आपको बोलने दिया जाएगा।..(**व्यवधान**).

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: When the time was extended, by taking away the Private Members, right, it was suggested that during the two-and-a-half hours, we will be able to speak on the statement of the hon. Defence Minister, and for that, a separate list of speakers was drawn up. (*Interruptions*)

Sir, this is not my perception. I only request you to say if it is true or not. (*Interruptions*) This is not fair, Sir.

श्री सनातन बिसि: सर, हमको एश्योर किया गया था

श्री सभापति: सबका नाम लिस्ट में हैं, लेकिन लिमिट तो करना पड़ेगा।

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Certainly, this is not the way to deal with such a sensitive subject. Time constraint is, of course, important. But the nature of the problem, the sensitive character of the problem has also to be taken into consideration. It is for you to decide. We had a discussion and there was an agreement to this effect. The Leader of the House is a party to that, the hon. Chairman is a party to that, the leaders of all other parties are a party to that. Now, this is not being taken care of. This is only what I can remind you.

श्री सनातन बिसि: सर, हमको बोला गया था बोलने के लिए।..(**व्यवधान**).. चेयरमैन साहब, हमको कहा गया था कि हमको बोलने दिया जाएगा।

MR. CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact, the whole idea was that we should finish this list. But the Vice-Chairman were there, others were there. If the debate could not be finished, it should not be the responsibility of the Vice-Chairman or the Chairman. If the Members speak for more time, then what can we do? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, the Chair is not divisible. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SATISH PRADHAN: If an hon. Member is not concluding within the time allotted to him, you have to stop him from speaking. But that does not mean that we should not get an opportunity to speak. (*Interruptions*)

श्री सनातन बिसि: चेयरमैन साहब, हमको एश्योरेंस दिया गया था बोलने के लिए।...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री वसीम अहमद (उत्तर प्रदेश): सर, चैयरमैन आप हैं, आपको डिसिजन लेना है।...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सनातन बिसि: सर, हमको एश्योरेंस दिया गया था कि हमको बोलने दिया जाएगा। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, the point is, if you want to continue till night, I have no objection. The Prime Minister has to reply in the Lok Sabha. He had fixed up five o'clock here... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES: Sir, it would be proper if all of them are given two minutes each.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT): I have no objection to the proposal; let the hon. Prime Minister make his speech and if there are Members who are really keen on speaking, they can speak after the statement of the Prime Minister.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: What a privilege! What generosity ! We are being allowed to speak after the reply of the Prime Minister! (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Gurudas Das Gupta is very fond of interrupting everybody. (*Interruptions*) Listen to me.

Some Members have not yet spoken in the second turn. But others have already spoken.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I give to my right to speak. But I put on record that this is an absolute abnormality and the hon. Leader of the House is saying something which is totally inconsistent with the tradition of the House, that the speakers should speak after the Prime Minister.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: Even I have not spoken.

चैयरमैन साहब, आपके कमरे में जो तय हुआ, जिसका बार-बार जिक्र किया जा रहा है, वहां यह तय हुआ था कि कल की लिस्ट को पहले ऐक्जहास्ट कर दिया जाएगा और जब वह लिस्ट खत्म हो जाएगी, उसके बाद अगर समय बच गया तो नए लोगों को बुलवाया जाएगा और वह भी टाईम के हिसाब से सारी पार्टियों को टाईम दिया जाएगा। हमारी पार्टी को उसमें से एक मिनट भी नहीं मिला है अगर उसके मुताबिक लिस्ट ऐक्जहास्ट नहीं हुई तो यह किसी और का कसूर नहीं है। बार-बार ऐसा होता है अब प्रधानमंत्री यहां उपस्थित हैं और यह उनका समय है तो उनको बोलने देना चाहिए ...(व्यवधान) इससे समय बचेगा ....(व्यवधान)

श्री सनातन बिसि: सिकन्दर साहब जब बोलते है कि We are fond of speaking. ये जब ऊंचा बोलेंगे तो We are unknown.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE): Mr. Chairman , Sir, at the outset, let me take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to the hon. Members for the worth-while discussion in the hon. House spreading over the last two days. What we have been discussing here, as in the other House, is an issue of vital national importance. I have benefited by the views expressed by the hon. Members. I am emboldened by the sense of unanimity and national purpose that pervades the House. It is, I have no doubt, a fitting tribute to the great excellence shown by the scientists of the DAE, the DRDO and the Armed Forces. Particularly, our gratitude goes to all those many who in the most adverse conditions brought to successful conclusions India's endeavours in this field.

Sir, I intend to take up three broad issues. I would like to be very brief. First is the timing of the nuclear tests, security environment and threat perception. The second is the concerns of United States of America, and the third is relations with China. many hon. Members have questioned our 'timing' as well as our assessment of the threat perception behind the decision to undertake the limited programme of underground nuclear tests, conducted on 11th and 13th. One answer came yesterday in the afternoon, quite loud and clear: The action taken by the Government of Pakistan should set at rest most queries regarding both 'timing' as well as 'threat perceptions'. Reference has already been made in this debate by my colleagues about the assessment of threat perception made by the previous Governments. We did not want to minimise the danger from the increase in the number of nuclear weapons in our neighbourhood. We should also bear in mind that the proxy war inflicted upon us for almost ten years, and which we cannot permit to continue, has a component of nuclear capability on the part of Pakistan. It is also known that that has been the consequence of aid from other countries. In the determination of timing for our tests, the recommendation of the scientific community was also factored. In any event, preparations from them had been under way for many years with the support of successive Governments. These preparations could not have been left in a state of indefinite suspension, particularly, as any further delay would have made our task, both technical and diplomatic, so much more complicated.

Hon. Members would also appreciate that the preparations for tests take time. What was

conducted yesterday could not have been done in the timeframe of a fortnight. The Government's stand and resolute measures taken have been entirely vindicated. I would like to assure the House that Pakistan's tests don't pose any new threat to our national security because we have been monitoring Pakistan's clandestine pursuit of its nuclear programme. We have been aware of acquisition by them of nuclear-capable aircraft as well as missiles from other countries. The statements by Pakistani leaders and others have been quite clear. After his first tenure in office, Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif had declared in August, 1994, that Pakistan possessed a nuclear bomb. Since 1990 the US Government has also been unable to certify that Pakistan doesn't possess a nuclear explosive device. As the House is well aware, India's programme is not country specific. Our concerns are deeper and broader in their scope. On the other hand, Pakistan's approach has always been Indo-centric. Indeed the justification given for the tests yesterday makes that abundantly clear. Hon. Members would also appreciate that in the post-cold war period there may have been some improvements in the security environment of the west, but clearly that is not replicated in other parts of the globe.

The post-cold war India's security environment has actually become more complicated with the accumulation of nuclear weapons and missiles in our neighbourhood. To this process our response has been and will remain measured and restrained. India doesn't intend to reinvent the empty doctrines and cliches of the cold war. We don't intend to join in an arms race, hostilities notwithstanding. We are committed to maintaining peace with stability in the region and beyond. Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif has put forward certain suggestions. With Pakistan we have always desired to pursue the path of peace and a constructive and comprehensive dialogue. This is the manifestation of our national confidence and strength. Our proposals for the modalities of the dialogue as also a range of other proposals are with Pakistan and we await their response. Our dialogue includes peace and security issues including confidence building measures. In this context let me reiterate my proposal to discuss "no-first use" with Pakistan. The international community can rest asssured that on our part there is no desire to heighten tension. While the imposition of national emergency in Pakistan is an internal matter for that country, I would like to make it abundantly clear that Pakistan faces no threat from India.

Sir, we are disappointed that the US has displayed a lack of appreciation of India legitimate security concerns. I wish to reiterate the Government's commitment to engage all principal interlocutors in a responsible dialogue. We remain ready to discuss and explain our position. Since 11th May the Government has taken certain initiatives. These initiatives are as follows: we are already observing a voluntary moratorium and are ready to consider and discuss converting it into a *de jure* commitment; we have volunteered to engage in negotiations on FMCT; India will undertake stringent export controls on nuclear and missile-related technology as well as those relating to other weapons of mass destruction, we had already announced and reiterated our offer to discuss a "no-first use" agreement with Pakistan as also with other countries, bilaterally or in a multilateral forum. These initiatives address substantially a number of concerns expressed by other countries.

Sir, so far as China is concerned, concern has been expressed by some hon. Members regarding China's reaction towards our decision. Let me assure this House that we seek good relations with our neighbours including China, our largest neighbour. India and China are two of the world's largest and most populous countries. We are linked through history and geography. We believe that the five principles of peaceful co-existence jointly enunciated by China and India are of continuing relevance to the developments of our relations. India like China is engaged in the task of economic development and realisation of the legitimate aspirations of our people. Our bilateral trade and economic cooperation has grown significantly. There is a considerable potential to expand our economic and commercial cooperation. But we have some concerns. We would like the Chinese side to appreciate that our concerns need to be addressed in a meaningful manner with a view to finding an

early resolution. There are issues relating to India's sovereignty, territorial integrity and security that have been reflected at various levels including the highest levels. The Indian people must feel assured that friendship with China will be a factor for peace and stability and will continue to enhance our security. On the boundary question, we recognise that a resolution requires time and patience. But progress can and should be made. Our concerns regarding China's defence cooperation with Pakistan remain. Unlike India-China relations which have shown improvement, despite the difficulties of the past, Paksitan remains unreconciled to good relations with India. Our view in regard to external military assistance to Pakistan has been consistent over the last 50 years. Given Pakistan's approach towards India any assistance in the defence field to Pakistan affects India's security directly and adversely. The Chinese side should pay attention to the depth of feeling on the Indian side. On our part we do not seek confrontation with China. We seek good relationship in which both sides are responsive to each other's concerns. We believe that a dialogue is the key to understanding; understanding is the key to resolution of differences and resolution of differences is the key to good relations. We remain committed to the process of a dialogue to resolve the outstanding differencs and to the development of friendly, cooperative, good neighbourly and mutually beneficial relations.

Sir, before I conclude, I would like to say a few words in Hindi.

सभापति महोदय, जिस विषय पर यह सदन इतने घंटों से चर्चा कर रहा है, वह राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा से संबंधित विषय है, बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण विषय है। राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा के प्रश्न पर देश में आम राय रही है। हम जब प्रतिपक्ष में थे, तब भी जब-जब राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा को आंच आई, सारे मतभेद भूल कर हमने उस समय की सरकार का समर्थन किया। जब पोखरण में पहला विस्फोट हुआ था, हमने उसका स्वागत किया था। हमने यह नहीं पूछा कि यह विस्फोट किसके खिलाफ किया जा रहा है? क्यों किया जा रहा है? हमने यह भी नहीं पूछा कि विस्फोट का फैसला करते समय आपने हमें विश्वास में क्यों नहीं लिया? प्रतिपक्ष को भरोसा क्यों नहीं दिलाया? क्योंकि हम जानते हैं कि राष्ट्र की रक्षा जैसे नाजुक मामलों का निर्णय जिस स्तर पर होता है, उस पर ज्यादा पूछताछ की गुंजाइश नहीं होती। निर्णय तक पहुंचने के पहले चर्चा हो सकती है, होती रही है लेकिन जब फैसले का वक्त आ जाए, जब घड़ी आ जाए तो फिर उसका निर्णय उसी दृष्टि से करना चाहिए जिस दृष्टि से उसकी गोपनीयता बनी रहे। और मैं केवल 1974 की बात नहीं कर रहा हूं। बंगलादेश का मुक्ति संग्राम, शास्त्री जी के नेतृत्व में लड़ी गई लड़ाई - कभी हमने अपने राजनीतिक हितों को, स्वार्थों को आड़े नहीं आने दिया। सच्चाई तो यह है कि अपनी राजनैतिक कठिनाईयों को बढ़ाकर हमने राष्ट्रीय संकट के समय सरकार का साथ दिया है। हमने कोई ऐहसान नहीं किया है, हमने अपने धर्म का पालन किया है। हम कहीं भी हैं लेकिन राष्ट्रीय रक्षा के सवाल पर हम सभी एक हैं, हमें एक होना चाहिए। जो निर्णय हुआ, उससे किसी का मतभेद हो सकता है। उन निर्णय को कार्यान्वित करने के बाद जो बहुत सी बातें कही गयी हैं, उनमें से कुछ बातें मुझे भी पसंद नहीं हैं लेकिन बंगलादेश के बाद भी आदरणीय इंदिरा जी का बड़ा अभिनंदन हुआ था। किसी ने आपत्ति नहीं की। जब जगजीवन राम जी हमारे रक्षा मंत्री थे, उन्हें भी उतना ही आदर मिलना चाहिए था लेकिन यह राजनीति की बातें हैं, इनमें मैं नहीं जाता। हमने फैसला किया, सोच-समझकर फैसला किया। उसमें राजनैतिक स्वार्थ की कोई गंध नहीं थी। चुनाव हम कराना चाहते हैं, यह हास्यास्पद है। हम क्यों चुनाव कराना चाहेंगे? अभी चुनाव हुए हैं। लेकिन यह आरोप लगाया गया है। चतुर्वेदी जी को लेकर हम पोखरण गये। मंच पर चतुर्वेदी जी विराजमान थे। अब उसमें संकुचित राजनीति कहां थी? अब अगर चतुर्वेदी जी को साथ ले जाना, यह संकुचित राजनीति है तो फिर विस्तृत राजनीति क्या है, इसकी मैं व्याख्या चतुर्वेदी जी के ऊपर छोड़ता हूं। इस प्रश्न पर सबको साथ लेकर चलने की हमारी इच्छा है। हम पाकिस्तान का बुरा नहीं चाहते और पाकिस्तान के मित्रों से मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूं कि अपने मन में से यह भ्रम निकाल दें, अपने मन में से यह धारणा निकाल दें कि हम उन्हें खत्म करना चाहते हैं। पाकिस्तान बन गया। पाकिस्तान फले-फूले, सुखी रहे, समृद्ध रहे। पाकिस्तान भी उन्ही समस्याओं से लड़ रहा है जिन समस्याओं से हम लड़ रहे हैं। और इसीलिए शान्ति का वातावरण चाहिए। इसीलिए मैंने कहा कि हम वार्ता के लिए तैयार हैं, हम सभी पड़ौसियों से वार्ता के लिए तैयार हैं। हमारे राष्ट्रपति इन दिनों नेपाल गये हुए हैं। नेपाल के साथ भी हमारी समस्याएं हैं नदी जल की समस्याएं हैं लेकिन सारी समस्याएं बातचीत के द्वारा हल हो सकती हैं। मैं पाकिस्तान के मित्रों से एक बात और कहना चाहूंगा कि जम्मू-काश्मीर को हथियारों के बल पर हथियाने की बात वह अपने मन में से निकाल दें।

मैं "हथियारों के बल पर इस पर जोर दे रहा हूं। वार्ता करें। हमें वार्ता करने में कोई आपत्ति नहीं है। चर्चा करें। अगर अब यह मामला हल नहीं होता तो अभी छोड़ दें। जो प्रश्न हल हो सकते हैं, उनको ले लिया जाए। उन पर सहयोग बढ़े। इस भूखंड का वातावरण बदलना चाहिए। कोई तीसरा इसमें दखल दे, इसके हम खिलाफ हैं और किसी तीसरे पक्ष को यहां आने की इजाजत हम नहीं देंगे। लेकिन इसके लिए जरूरी है कि संबंधों में सुधार हो। संबंधों में सुधार पड़ौसियों के साथ हो। और देश तो हमारे साथ सहयोग से चल रहे हैं और हम उनका सहयोग ले भी रहे हैं, और उन्हें दे भी रहे हैं। लेकिन सदन के भीतर और सदन के बाहर दलबन्दी की राजनीति की एक सीमा होनी चाहिए। जब वह सीमा पार हो जाती है तो कठिनाई पैदा होती है। कल के बाद एक अच्छा वातावरण बना है और मैं जानता हूं कि अभी हमारे प्रणब मुखर्जी बाबू कई सवाल मन में संजोए बैठे हैं और वे मेरे ऊपर तीर की तरह से उन सवालों को छोड़ना चाहते हैं लेकिन मैं उनसे कहूंगा कि सवाल न पूछें। जो कुछ मैंने कहा है नपे-तुले शब्दों में कहा है, सोच-समझकर कहा है और आगे भविष्य में चर्चा करने के और भी मौके मिलेंगे। डॉक्टर मनमोहन सिंह जी ने कुछ महत्वपूर्ण सवाल उठाये थे। आर्थिक रुकावटें पैदा करने की बात हो रही है, अभी उनका स्वरूप निश्चित नहीं। हमें किन कठिनाइयों का आर्थिक क्षेत्र में सामना करना पड़ेगा, इसका नक्शा साफ नहीं है। लेकिन कल और आज में दोनों सदनों में यह संकल्प प्रकट हुआ है कि जहां हम अपने वैज्ञानिकों का सम्मान करते हैं, आदर करते हैं और वैज्ञानिक प्रगति की सराहना करते हैं वहां अगर हम पर कोई बाहर से चीज थोपने की कोशिश की गई तो हम उसका भी विरोध करेंगे, हम उसका भी मिलकर सामना करेंगे। इस समय देश में शांति बनाए रखना बहुत आवश्यक है। कल टेलीविजन पर जिस तरह का जनून को प्रकट करने वाला भाषण दिया गया, वह ठीक नहीं हुआ। मैं नहीं जानता क्या भारत के विरुद्ध उन्माद पैदा करना जरूरी है। आपने विस्फोट किया है, आपका अधिकार है विस्फोट करना, उसकी आलोचना करना हमारा अधिकार है, लेकिन हमने विस्फोट किया, हमने तो उसे पाकिस्तान को केन्द्रित करके नहीं किया। हमने तो मजहबी उन्माद पैदा करने की कोशिश नहीं की। यह देश बहु-धर्मी है, यह देश बहु-भाषी है, यह देश विविधताओं से भरा हुआ है, इस देश में भड़काने वाली बातें नहीं होनी चाहिएं और अगर कोई कर रहा है तो वह गलत कर रहा है। इस समय सावधानी की जरूरत है। मैं गया था मुम्बई और मुझे पत्रकारों ने पूछा कि यहां एक पाकिस्तानी गायक आए थे और उनके गायन को लोगों ने सुना नहीं और गायन की सभा भंग कर दी गई, आप इसे एप्रूव करते हैं या डिस-एप्रूव करते हैं? मैंने कहा कि मैं डिस-एप्रूव करता हूं। जो कुछ किया है वह गलत किया गया है।

अब कहीं कोका-कोला की बोतलें तोड़ी जा रही हैं, आपको अगर नहीं पीना है तो मत पीजिए, बोतल, टूटने में यह डर है कि पैर में चुभ जाएगी और कोका-कोला की जगह किसी और तरह का रंगदार द्रवण निकलना शुरू हो जाएगा। मगर इतना बड़ा देश है इन सबको लेकर, इन सबको सहन करते हुए, इन सब की रोकथाम करते हुए अगर हम मिलकर चलेंगे सभापति महोदय, तो मैं समझता हूं कि कोई कारण नहीं है कि हम वर्तमान संकटों पर हल न प्राप्त कर लें।

Sir, now I conclude by making a Statement. The hon. Members have clearly indicated a sense of solidarity in meeting any challenges to India's security with firmness and resolve. This Government welcomes this expression of unity. This is the back-bone of our national will. Let us ensure that the House will, in keeping with the traditions, reflect a consensus on vital issues of national security. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I adjourn the House till 11 o' clock on Monday, the 1st June, 1998.

The House then adjourned at forty-nine minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 1st June, 1998.

GIPRRND—72 GIPMR/99—300 Copies